DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 102 898 HE 006 263

AUTHOR Lindeman, Lynn William
TITLE University Goals and Collective Bargaining.
INSTITUTION Oklahoma Univ., Norman. Center for Studies in Higher Education.
PUB DATE Sep 74
NOTE 130p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$6.97 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Collective Bargaining; *Collective Negotiation; *Educational Objectives; *Faculty; *Higher Education; Universities

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between university faculty and administrator attitudes toward collective bargaining in terms of their view of the goals and the functions of the university. The faculty and administrators in a single, large, multipurpose state university were sampled to provide three test groups: administrators, faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, and faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. The three test groups were compared on the basis of their perception of the importance the institution accorded goals and the emphasis given to institutional functions. The findings indicated that faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations differed significantly from other test groups in their perception of the importance the institution accorded goals and functions. (Author/MJM)

ED102898

The Center for Studies in Higher Education

CSHE

MONOGRAPH SERIES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UNIVERSITY GOALS AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Lynn W. Lindeman

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA · SEPTEMBER, 1974

INTRODUCTION TO MONOGRAPH SERIES

The Center for Studies in Higher Education at the University of Oklahoma introduces a new monograph series in its continuing search for avenues of communication with the world of learning.

The Center for Studies in Higher Education is dedicated to the exploration of pertinent subjects falling within the purview of higher education as a social enterprise. The Center is interested in higher education's history, its contemporary importance to the social order, and its prospects for the future. This interest embraces the ceaselessly changing variety of internal relationships according to which academia functions as a social organism, proceeds toward its diverse goals -- preserving, transmitting, and transforming the culture of which it continues to be a necessary part.

The first publication in the Series, University Goals and Collective Bargaining by Lynn W. Lindeman, reports an investigation of a contemporary concern among educators across the country - collective bargaining. More specifically, the study examined the relationship between university faculty and administrators attitudes toward collective bargaining in terms

of their views of the goals and the functions of the university. The faculty and administrators in a single large, multi-purpose state university were sampled to provide three test groups; administrators, faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, and faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. The three test groups were compared on the basis of their perception of the importance the institution accorded goals and the emphasis given institutional functions. The findings indicated that faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations differed significantly from other test groups in their perceptions of the importance the institution accorded goals and functions. It is anticipated that these findings will assist students of higher education in extending the examination of collective bargaining in higher education beyond the level of operational contexts.

The author of the first monograph, Lynn W. Lindeman, received his Ph. D. in higher education administration at the University of Oklahoma. He has been actively involved with collective bargaining in higher education, both as a researcher and negotiator. He has served in both a teaching and/or administrative capacity at Western Michigan University, the University of Oklahoma, and is currently Executive Assistant to the President of the University of Guam.

A word of appreciation should be added for the assistance provided the Center by the E. K. Gaylord Foundation for a generous contribution that made possible the initiation of this series.

Herbert R. Hengst
Professor of Education
Director, Center for Studies in
Higher Education
University of Oklahoma

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION v

LIST OF TABLES vi

CHAPTER

I INTRODUCTION 1

II THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH . . 21

III RESEARCH DESIGN 33

IV PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA . . 58

V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 88

APPENDIX 108

BIBLIOGRAPHY 113

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1 Reliability of Preliminary I.G.I. Goal Areas 43

2 Reliability of I.G.I. Goal Areas . . . 44

3 I.F.I.-M. Test-Retest Reliability Coefficients 47

4 Administrator and Faculty Groups as Defined by the C.N.S. 59

5 Approximate F Test Results for the I.G.I.: Perceived Goals 60

6 Comparisons of Group Means and Grand Means For Perceived Goal Components of the I.G.I. 61

7 I.G.I. F Test Results 62

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE		
8	Findings of Scheffe Test: Perceived Goal Area Comparisons Between Groups . .	63
9	Approximate F Test Results for the I.G.I.: Preferred Goals	65
10	Comparison of Group Means and Grand Mean For the Preferred Goal Components of the I.G.I.	66
11	I.G.I.-Preferred Goals Component F Test Results	67
12	Findings of Scheffe Test: Preferred Goal Area Comparisons Between Groups . .	68
13	Approximate F Test Results for the I.F.I.-M.	70
14	Comparison of Group Means and Grand Mean For the I.F.I.-M.	72
15	I.F.I.-M. F Test Results	73
16	Findings of Scheffe Test: Function Area Comparisons Between Groups	74
17	Pierson Product Moment Correlation Results	76
18	Faculty Percentages of Response Choice for Items of the C.N.S. Categorized as Measures of Attitudes Toward Collective Action	79
19	Faculty Percentages of Response Choice for Items of the C.N.S. Categorized as Measures of Attitudes Toward Sanctions	82
20	Faculty Percentages of Response Choice for Items of the C.N.S. Categorized as Measures of Attitudes Toward Withholding of Services	85

DEDICATION

These pages are dedicated to the memory of Dr. Robert E. Ohm, late Dean of the College of Education, University of Oklahoma, who served as an inspiration and guide to this student of higher education.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

The contemporary literature on higher education expresses considerable interest in institutional goals, practices, and the recent emergence of collective bargaining in higher education.

The current focus on institutional goals in higher education has as its genesis what David Riesman calls the "collision course" in higher education between the increased expectations of the public and the limited resources available.[1] When Harvard was founded in 1636, higher education was to be for a miniscule elite. Institutions of higher education, as the nineteenth century progressed, expanded the services they provided. The award of the first Ph. D. at Yale in 1861 and the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 were watersheds in higher education history, they marked the beginning of the research and service function of American higher education. World Wars I and II, and the reaction to

---

[1]David Riesman, "The Collision Course of Higher Education", The Journal of College Student Personnel, 10 (Nov., 1969), pp. 363-369.

Sputnik in 1957 serve as indicators of the increased demands on higher education to provide research and service. "The University has become a prime instrument of national purpose."[2]

Institutions of higher education have become what Jacques Barzun compares to a "firehouse on the corner", responding to all calls for assistance.[3] Robert Hutchins has compared the university to a medieval guild which "undertook to be everything for the town".[4] Institutions have simply added functions to existing ones to meet the needs of their constituents. President Johnson's statement that "we expect institutions of higher learning to right many of society's wrongs such as poverty and social injustice; we expect them to make the lame walk and to devise ways to feed the world's hungry; and we expect them to offer blueprints for the curbing of inflation" provides a verbalization of the expectations for higher education to solve the nation's ills.[5]

The increased demands of society have come into

---

[2]Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (New York: Harper, 1963), p. 87.

[3]Jacques Barzun, The American University: How it Runs and Where It's Going (New York: Harper, 1968).

[4]Robert Hutchins, The University in America. An Occasional Paper of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, Calif., (1966), p. 29.

[5]L. B. Johnson, quoted in Gene A. Budig, ed., Perceptions in Public Higher Education (Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1970), p. xi.

collision with The New Depression in Higher Education.[6] Americans still expect great things from their systems of higher education, but they have come to balk at the price. When one considers that tuition fees have risen three to four times as fast as the national price index for other goods and services, with only medical and hospital costs having risen faster, the reaction of the public is understandable.[7] With the cost of a single conventional course with twenty students being no less than $20,000,[8] and the estimated real cost of a students higher education being $9,070 per year,[9] it is readily apparent that educational costs have risen. While educational costs have risen to new heights, financial resources seem to have reached limits of availability, and competition for limited resources with other institutions that service society has increased. "The crunch of new demands against limited resources"[10] has served

---

[6]Earl F. Cheit, The New Depression in Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971).

[7]Louis T. Benezet, "Continuity and Change: The Need for Both," in The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change, John Caffrey, ed., (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969), p. 19.

[8]Howard R. Bowen and Gordon K. Douglas, Efficiency in Liberal Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), p. 85.

[9]Howard R. Bowen and Paul Servelle, Who Benefits From Higher Education and Who Should Pay? (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1972), pp. 31-32.

[10]Richard E. Peterson, The Crisis of Purpose: Definition and Uses of Institutional Goals, Report No. 5. (Washington, D.C.: E.R.I.C. Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1970), p. 1.

to focus attention toward the goals of institutionalized higher education.

Institutions of higher learning are increasingly being called upon to articulate their goals in ways meaningful to their constituencies. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education's 1972 publication, The More Effective Use of Resources: An Imperative for Higher Education, notes that one solution to the financial crisis is for "institutions to carefully analyze the relations between the use of resources and the accomplishment of goals . . . ".[11] In 1947 the Truman Commission of Higher Education stated that the major need of American colleges and universities was "to see clearly what it is they are trying to accomplish", we are little closer today than we were in 1947.[12] Today the need for clear-cut goals has reached a crisis stage, "a crisis of purpose".[13] The need for clear, explicit goal statements to provide focus and direction are heard from numerous

---

[11]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The More Effective Use of Resources: An Imperative for Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), p. viii.

[12]Francis Horn, Challenge and Perspective in Higher Education (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971), p. 224.

[13]Peterson, The Crisis of Purpose. p. 1.

sources.[14] Currently the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education is devoting considerable attention to the development of models which facilitate goal setting.[15]

As growth has begotten more growth, and specialization more specialization, institutions have become, to use Clark Kerr's term, "multi-versities". Now in the period of financial restraint, the task that James Perkins pointed out in 1966, "to draw the lines between their legitimate and illegitimate functions, and to see clearly where their mission begins and ends",[16] is of particular importance to institutions of higher education. Decisions of choices of missions will not be easy ones, because universities are "multi-versities, not one community, but several."[17] As

---

[14]See for example: Oliver C. Carmichael, "Major Strengths and Weaknesses in Higher Education," Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: A.A.H.E., 1953); Donald Faulkner, "The Formation of Institutional Objectives," Journal of Higher Education, 29(Nov., 1958), pp. 425-430; Nicholas Demerath, Richard Stephens, and Robb Taylor, Power, Presidents and Professors (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967); Philip Winstead and Edward Hobson, "Institutional Goals: Where to From Here?" Journal of Higher Education, 42(Nov., 1971), pp. 669-677; Charles S. Nelson, "Observations on the Scope of Higher Education Planning in the United States," in Paul Hamelman, ed., Managing the University: A Systems Approach (New York: Praeger Publications, 1972), pp. 31-47.

[15]Ben Lawrence, "The W.I.C.H.E. Planning and Management Systems Program: Its Nature, Scope, and Limitations," pp. 49-75 in Hamelman.

[16]James Perkins, The University in Transition (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966), p. 23.

[17]Kerr, p. 19.

institutions are increasingly forced to choose among alternatives and priorities, those diverse elements of the university will compete to determine whose goals become the institutional goals.[18]

"The new university is a conflict-prone organization. Its many purposes push and pull in different directions."[19] On many campuses there are widely divergent views and often conflicting ones, as to the proper role of the institution.[20] A recent study by Lipset and Ladd notes that the "professoriate has become deeply divided because it has become extraordinarily disparate in its range of fields, substantive interests, and outside associations . . . ".[21] The lack of unity in the modern university can be noted in Hutchins' description of the modern university as a "series of separate schools and departments held together by a central heating system",[22] and Clark Kerr's notation of it as "a series of

---

[18]Richard Peterson, Toward Institutional Goal-Consciousness, Report from the Proceedings of the 1971 Western Regional Conference on Testing Problems (Berkeley, Calif.: E. T. C., 1971), p. 11.

[19]Burton R. Clark, "The New University", in Carlos Kruytbosch and Sheldon Messinger (eds.), The State of the University: Authority and Change (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1968), pp. 17-26.

[20]Peterson, Crisis, p. 1.

[21]Seymour Lipset and Everett Ladd, "The Divided Professoriate", Change, 3(May-June, 1971),p. 54.

[22]Hutchins, quoted in Kerr, p. 20.

individual faculty entrepreneurs held together by a common grievance over parking".[23] While all the constituencies of the university desire to see it fulfill its true purpose, there are "several visions of true purpose, each relating to a different layer of history, a different web of forces."[24] "The university is so many things to so many different people that it must, of necessity, be partially at war with itself."[25] There are then, competing conceptions of what the university should be. It has been noted that the growth of the sixties was not the result of planning, but the result of accommodation between "competing power blocks".[26] Competition can be expected to increase as universities go through the process of getting more effective uses out of resources.[27] Much of the concern over academic governance and resource allocation has at its base the realization that competing definitions of institutional purposes are determined by those who control those processes.

One of the most frequent complaints in academe is

---

[23]Kerr, p. 20

[24]Kerr, pp. 8-9.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Richard E. Peterson, "Reform in Higher Education: Remarks of the Left and Right", Liberal Education, 55(March, 1969), p..60.

[27]Carnegie Commission, The More Effective Use of Resources, p. 21.

that administration is failing to set goals,[28] by the same token another most common complaint is that the faculty are not allowed enough influence in goal determination.[29] Burton Clark and others have noted that in the multiversity there are two primary interest groups, the faculty and the administration. There has developed an "administrative class with interests and ideologies of its own".[30] It is anticipated that admininstrative power will grow in the future. The financial crises will cause a greater degree of centralization and "administration, because it deals with money, and money is now particularly important, will gain authority".[31] The Carnegie Commission notes that while administration may be viewed as a means to an end, under circumstances as they are now, "it may come to seem, and even sometimes be, that the means determine the ends".[32] While the administrators have seemingly been gaining greater power, some faculty have been asking for a greater role in planning, budgeting, and finance allocation, and the setting

---

[28]T. R. McConnell, "The Function of Leadership in Academic Institutions", Educational Record, 49(Spring, 1968), pp. 145-153.

[29]See: William E. Moran, "A Systems View of University Organization", pp. 3-12 in Hamelman; also Faulkner, and Barzun.

[30]Clark, p. 19.

[31]Carnegie Commission, The More Effective Use of Resources, p. 21.

[32]Ibid.

of institutional goals and priorities.[33]

> A growth in the power of administrators represents an upset in the presumed balance between academic activities and support activities on campus. The faculty often grumbles that administrators are overpaid, and that too much attention is given to support activities (often called simply red tape) rather than to the goals of the university. Faculty members resent too what they feel to be the illegitimate pretensions of some administrators to "represent" the faculty or the university. The growth in the power of administrators is not, in itself, regarded as necessarily undesirable, even by the academic person (who typically holds highly traditional views of what the university ought to be doing), provided that administrators use their power to help the university attain goals that academic people accept. The situation becomes a source of genuine concern only when administrators are seen both as having more power than the faculty and as using that power to pursue goals considered undesirable or, at least, tangential to desirable goals.[34]

Tension has been fostered in higher education because the administrators have usually ended up taking the initiative in planning, while the faculty have played a reactive role.[35]

The proper role of administration and faculty in goal setting is still being debated. There are those who

---

[33]Terrence Tice, "Pros and Cons of Collective Bargaining", in Terrence Tice, ed., Faculty Power, Collective Bargaining on Campus (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute of Continuing Legal Education, 1972), pp. 129-137.

[34]Edward Gross and Paul V. Grambsch, University Goals and Academic Power (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1968), p. 2.

[35]Ernest Palola, Timothy Lehmann, and William Blishke, "The Reluctant Planner: Faculty in Institutional Planning", The Journal of Higher Education, 42(Oct., 1971), pp. 587-602.

desire the president to be the goal determiner. A review of the literature on the job of the president leaves one with the impression that it is the president's most important function. Henry Wriston writes: "An essential part of the presidents job is long-range planning."[36] Harold Stoke writes: "It is his unique job to clarify the purposes of the institution and how best to achieve them."[37] Herbert Simon writes that the president "should be a leader in setting institutional goals."[38] Douglas Brown writes: "The president of a college should essentially be its leader in general educational policy."[39] Robert Osmunson, in a study of presidential inaugural speeches, found that approximately 95% of the presidents made reference to the presidents role of providing educational leadership by providing institutional direction.[40] Others claim that the proper role of administration is to maximize faculty determination of institutional goals. While there is disagreement on the role faculty and

---

[36]Henry Wriston, The Academic Procession (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), p. 116.

[37]Harold Stoke, The American College President (New York: Harper and Row, 1959).

[38]Herbert Simon, "The Job of a College President," Educational Record, XLVII(Winter, 1969), p. 70.

[39]J. Douglas Brown, "Mr. Ruml's Memoirs: A Wrong Approach to the Right Problem," Journal of Higher Education, XXX(Nov., 1959), p. 415.

[40]Robert Lee Osmunson, "Higher Education as Viewed by College and University Presidents," School and Society, XCVIII(Oct., 1970), p. 369.

administration should play in goal determination, there is a realization among some that goal consensus is necessary for institution effectiveness.[41] How to gain a consensus on university goals is one of the major questions facing higher education. Two major options are now competing for support. One is shared governance, and the other is formal bargaining. Algo Henderson notes that there are two primary faculty participation models, shared governance and collective negotiations.[42] The concept of shared governance is that traditional to higher education. It finds its classic statement in the 1966 "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities", issued jointly by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.[43] Basic to this shared governance concept is that concensus can be reached by participative decision making. Supporters of this option urge administration to "collegialize their relationship".[44]

---

[41]See: Demerath, Stephens, and Taylor; James A. Perkins; Clifton Wharton, "Internal Decision Processes of the University", Educational Record, 52(1971), pp. 240-243; and Winstead and Hobson.

[42]Algo Henderson, "Control in Higher Education: Trends and Issues", The Journal of Higher Education, XL(Jan., 1969), pp. 1-11.

[43]Louis Joughin, ed., Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Handbook of the A. A. U. P. (Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), pp. 90-101.

[44]Demerath, Stephens, and Taylor, p. 216.

Increasingly, faculty are electing the second model of bargaining as a "decision-making process" in higher education.[45] While it is argued that bargaining will "carry with it the automatic end of governance as we know it today,"[46] others point out that conflict and negotiations are basic to governance as we know it today.[47]

> The resolution of conflict in modern organizations is made difficult by the fact that conflict is not formally recognized, hence legitimated. To legitimate conflict would be inconsistent with the monocratic nature of hierarchy. It would require formal bargaining procedures. Modern organizations, through the formal hierarchy of authority, seek an "administered consenses". Conflict resolution, therefore, must occur informally in surrptitious and somewhat illegal means. Or else it must be repressed, creating a phony atmosphere of good feeling and superficial harmony.[48]

The bargaining model requires that "groups would negotiate issues relating to goals and methods . . . "[49]

As of January, 1972, approximately fifty-five

---

[45]American Association of Colleges, "Collective Bargaining: Its Fiscal Implications," 1970. pp. 1-8. (Mimeographed.)

[46]Clarence Hughes, "Collective Bargaining and the Private Colleges," Intellect, (Oct., 1972), p. 42.

[47]See: Gordon Hullfish, "A Theoretical Consideration of Educational Administration," in Walter Hack, et.al. Educational Administration: Selected Readings (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965), pp. 38-54; James D. Thompson and William J. McEwen, "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal Setting as an Interaction Process," American Sociological Review, 23(Feb., 1958), pp. 23-31.

[48]Victor A. Thompson, "Hierarchy, Specialization, and Organizational Conflict," Administrative Science Quarterly, 5(March, 1961), p. 521.

[49]Henderson, "Control in Higher Education: Trends and Issues," p. 7.

thousand academic personnel had elected bargaining agents on one-hundred-sixty-three campuses in seventeen states.[50] Many, as Malcolm Scully, former editor of the Chronicle of Higher Education, wrote, "believe academic professionals should organize because, unlike other professions, they are employed by institutions. Their goals and those of the institution may sometimes differ."[51]

> Unions on campus have not denied that there are legitimate institutional goals. They have not denied that there is a community of interest shared by the institution and the faculty. But they have emphasized that the goals of a system and of the faculty may differ widely and that conflict will inevitably arise as the generalized goals of the institution are translated into decisions on operation and policy. Hence, the role of the union is to make sure that actions taken reflect the interests of the faculty.[52]

The contracts negotiated to date are primarily concerned with economic matters.[53] This concern for financial rewards has tended to push goal formulation into the background, but as Allen Smith, Vice-President for Academic Affairs at the University of Michigan, has noted, "One can not bargain exclusively on economic relationships forever. Surely the other side of the table will want something in

---

[50]Tice, p. 291.

[51]Malcolm G. Scully, "Should Faculties Organize?" in Tice, pp. 121-122.

[52]Charles M. Rehmus, "Alternatives to Bargaining and Traditional Governance," in Tice, p. 92.

[53]Carol H. Schulman, Collective Bargaining on Campus (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1972), p. 4.

return for the money."[54] The Carnegie Commission has recommended that institutions with faculty that employ collective bargaining employ negotiations experts and "consider agreements that will induce increases in productivity of faculty members . . . "[55]

> While bargaining may focus on resources rather than explicitly on goals, the fact remains that it is improbable that a goal can be effective unless it is at least partially implemented. To the extent that bargaining sets limits on the amount of resources available or the ways they may be employed, it effectively sets limits on choice of goals.[56]

The prospect of goal determination via collective bargaining requires that the relationship between institutional goal perception and collective bargaining be investigated.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this research is to investigate the extent to which faculty and administrator perceptions of institutional goals and functions are related to faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining.

More specifically, this study seeks answers to the following questions:

1. What attitudes do university faculty members hold toward collective negotiations?

---

[54]Allen F. Smith, "Should Faculties Organize?" in Tice, pp. 119-120.

[55]Carnegie Commission, The More Effective Use of Resources, p. 89.

[56]Thompson and McEwen, p. 27.

2. Is the degree of agreement between faculty members and administrators on the importance of perceived institutional goals significantly related to attitudes toward collective negotiations?

3. Is the degree of agreement between faculty members and administrators on the importance of perceived institutional preferred goals significantly related to attitudes toward collective negotiations?

4. Is the degree of agreement between faculty members and administrators of the emphasis given to a perceived function related to attitudes toward collective negotiations?

5. Are certain biographic-career characteristics related to favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations?

Need for the Study

Today over 55,000 academic personnel have elected collective bargaining agents.[57] Increasingly, bills are being introduced into state legislatures to enable collective negotiations in higher education. For example, the 34th Oklahoma Legislature has seen the introduction of House Bill No. 1348, "Establishing the Right of Collective Bargaining by the Professional Staff of Colleges; Providing for Recognition of Bargaining Agents for Professional Staff."[58] The statutory right to bargain collectively is thought to

---

[57]Tice, p. 291.

[58]House Bill No. 1348 introduced by Lindstrum, 34th Legislature, 1st session, Oklahoma, 1973.

have acted as an impetus to collective bargaining.[59] The competition between the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, and the American Association of University Professors to represent faculty as bargaining agents will increase the utilization of collective negotiations by faculty members.[60]

Recently the importance of identifying institutional goals for the purpose of planning has become well known.[61] Such financial planning systems as Program Planning Budgeting, (P.P.B.S.), requires identification of goals as a starting point,[62] as does a Management Information System.[63] The implementation of the concept of accountability also requires goal identification.[64] This study will provide

---

[59]Schulman, p. 5.

[60]Ibid., p. 6

[61]Elaine S. and G. I. Swanson, (eds.), Educational Planning in the United States (Itasic, Ill.: 1969).

[62]Ben Lawrence, George Weathersby, and Virginia Palters, (eds.), The Outputs of Higher Education: Their Proxies, Measurement, and Evaluation (Boulder, Colo.: W.I.C.H.E., 1970).

[63]W. J. Minter and Ben Lawrence, (eds.), Management Information Systems: Their Development and Use in the Administration of Higher Education (Boulder, Colo.: W.I.C.H.E., 1969).

[64]Kenneth P. Mortimer, Accountability in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: A.A.H.E., 1972).

information on the perceived goals of the faculty and administration of a large multi-purpose state university.

An extensive review of the literature relating to goals and collective bargaining indicates that no study has yet been undertaken examining the relationship between faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining and their perception of institutional goals. While no studies have been undertaken, literature in the field indicates that there is reason to investigate whether attitudes toward collective bargaining are related to perceptions of institutional goals. Dissatisfaction with the role of faculty in governance, which is often cited as a cause for faculty unionization, seems to have at its base the feeling that faculty should determine institutional directions, and that there is dissatisfaction with administration in this regard.[65] Some authors point out that conflict between administration and faculty reflects differences of opinion over future directions of growth.[66]

---

[65]See for example: Arnold R. Weber, "Academic Negotiations: Alternatives to Collective Bargaining," A report presented at the 22nd National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the A.A.H.E., Chicago, March 6, 1967. (E.R.I.C. ED 014 122), p. 2; American Association for Higher Education, Faculty Participation in University Governance (Washington, D.C.: A.A.H.E., 1967); Isreal Kugler, "Collective Bargaining for Faculties," Liberal Education, 56(March, 1970), p. 80.

[66]See: Malcolm Scully in Tice; Allen F. Smith in Tice; and Harold Orland, The Effects of Federal Programs on Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: The Brooking Institute, 1962).

Algo Henderson and others have pointed out that collective bargaining is one model available to reach agreements on institutional direction and priorities.[67] This study will investigate attitudes toward collective bargaining and faculty goal perception to determine if a relationship does exist between the two.

Definition of Terms

1. Administrators: Those administrative officers who hold positions of Director and above in the administrative hierarchy within the institution.

2. Attitude: "An attitude is a personal disposition common to individuals, but possessed to different degrees, which impels them to react to objects, situations, or propositions in a way that can be called favorable or unfavorable."[68]

3. Collective Negotiations: "A process in which conditions of employment are determined by agreement between representatives of an organized group of employees on the one hand, and one or more employers on the other."[69]

4. Consensus: The degree of agreement between administrators and faculty members on the importance of perceived institutional goals.

5. Faculty: Full-time staff holding academic rank who are not administrators.

6. Favoring collective negotiations: Scoring above +1

---

[67]Algo Henderson, "Control in Higher Education: Trends and Issues"; Also, Charles J. Ping, "On Learning to Live With Collective Bargaining," Journal of Higher Education, XLIV(Feb., 1973), pp. 102-114.

[68]J. P. Guilford, Psychometric Methods (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954), pp. 456-457.

[69]Dale Yoder, Personnel Management and Industrial Relations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962), p. 165.

standard deviation above the mean on the Collective Negotiations Scale.

7. Institutional functions: The perceived actions and practices of the institution. These can be considered operational sub-goals.[70]

8. Institutional goals: Goals, as used in this study, refer to non-operational goals, those future states which the faculty and administrators perceive they are moving toward.[71]

9. Not favoring collective negotiations: Scoring below -1 standard deviation below the mean on the Collective Negotiations Scale.

10. Perception: A judgement concerning the importance of an institutional goal or the emphasis given an institutional practice on the part of a faculty member or administrator.

Null Research Hypotheses

Ho_1 There is no significant difference of agreement on the perceived importance of institutional goals among administrators, faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations (score high on C. N. S.) and faculty who do not have favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations (score low on C. N. S.) as measured by the Institutional Goals Inventory and the Collective Negotiations Scale.

Ho_2 There is no significant difference of agreement on the perceived importance of preferred institutional goals among administrators, faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations (score high on C. N. S.) and faculty who do not have favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations (score low on C. N. S.) as measured by the Institutional Goals Inventory and the Collective Negotiations Scale.

---

[70]James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Organizations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 156.

[71]Amita Etzioni, Modern Organizations (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 7.

Ho_3 There is no significant difference of agreement on the perceived emphases given an institutional practice among administrators, faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations (score high on C.N.S.) and faculty who do not have favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations (score low on C.N.S.) as measured by the Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification, and the Collective Negotiations Scale.

Ho_4 There is no significant relationship between the selected biographic-career characteristics of tenure, age, sex, rank, terminal degree status, university-wide committee membership, faculty senate membership, and faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations as measured by the Collective Negotiations Scale.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study was limited to a sample of the full-time faculty and administrators of a large multipurpose state university.

2. The results of the study are limited to the general time period in which the study was conducted.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH

Theoretical Framework

The works of March and Simon, and Charles Perrow provide the basic theoretical framework for the study. Other organizational theorists as Thompson, McEwen, and Simon also provide support for the idea that bargaining results when goals are not shared.

March and Simon's theory of formal organizations distinguishes between two types of goals, operational and non-operational. Operational goals allow for means ends analysis, and non-operational goals require sub-goals to be operational. They also see organizational behavior as intendedly rational. March and Simon then postulate two types of decision-making processes associated with the two types of goals.

> When a number of persons are participating in a decision-making process, and these individuals have the same operational goals, differences in opinion about the course of action will be resolved by predominately analytic processes, i.e. by the analysis of the expected consequences of courses of action for realization of the shared goals. When either of the postulated conditions is absent from the situation (when goals are not shared, or when

> the shared goals are not operational and the operational subgoals are not shared), the decision will be reached by predominately bargaining processes.[72]

Charles Perrow points out that a major impediment to the understanding of organizational behavior has been the lack of adequate distinction between goals. He points out that the most relevant goals in understanding behavior are not "official goals" but "operative" goals. Official goals are general purposes put forth in charters and public statements, official goals are purposely vague and general. Operative goals designate ends sought through operating policies, they are means to official goals. "Operative" goals reflect choices among competing values. The operative goals are tied directly to group interests and may or may not support official goals. "The operative goals will be shaped by the dominant groups, reflecting the imperatives of a particular task area that is most critical."[73]

Thompson and McEwen note that goals of an organization should not be viewed as constants, and that reappraisal of goals is a recurrent problem in an organization. They also note reappraisal of goals is more difficult as the product is less tangible. The setting of goals is seen essentially

---

[72]March and Simon, Organizations, p. 156.

[73]Charles Perrow, "The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organizations", American Sociological Review, 26(1961), pp. 854-866.

as a problem of defining desired relationships between an organization and its environment. The organization can survive only if it adjusts to its environment. Bargaining is noted to provide environmental control over organizational goals and reduces the probability of arbitrary unilateral goal setting. One of the most important parts of the environment is seen to be the organization members, collective bargaining reviews the basis for continued support of the organization by organization members. "Bargaining appears, therefore, to involve the actual decision process. To the extent that the second parties support is necessary, he is in a position to exercise a veto over final choice of alternative goals and hence takes part in the decision."[74]

Simon presents the notion of goals as constraint sets. According to Simon, organizational goals can be viewed as widely shared constraint sets. One way to develop widely shared constraint sets is through bargaining.[75]

Victor Thompson theorizes that most of the conflict in organizations is due to differing perceptions of reality between specialists and those in hierarchical positions, and that such conflict can be resolved by formal bargaining if

---

[74]Thompson and McEwen, "Organizational Goals and Environment," pp. 23-31.

[75]Herbert A. Simon, "On the Concept of Organizational Goals," Administrative Science Quarterly, 9(June, 1964), pp. 2-22.

conflict was recognized as legitimate.[76] A number of behavioralist goal theorists view goal determination as a result of continuing conflict and processes of bargaining.[77]

Related Research

While theorists such as Parsons[78] and Simon[79] have noted that the concept of goals is central to the study of organizational behavior, there has been relatively little study of organizational goals or goal formulation in higher education.

In 1961 Charles Perrow stated that social scientists have given little attention to the study of goals of large-scale organizations.[80] One year later, in his seminal volume, The American College, Nevitt Sanford emphasized that "it is one of our tasks to study goals, discovering what we can about their origins . . . means through which they can be reached and their consequences . . . "[81] While response to Sanford's challenge has been slow, a number of empirical

---

[76]Thompson, "Hierarchy, Specialization and Organizational Conflict".

[77]Walter A. Hill and Douglas Egan, Readings in Organizational Theory: A Behavioral Approach (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1966).

[78]Talcott Parsons, Structure and Process in Modern Societies (New York: Free Press, 1960).

[79]Simon, "On the Concept of Organizational Goals".

[80]Charles Perrow, "The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organizations," p. 854.

[81]Nevitt Sanford, The American College (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962).

studies have been undertaken concerning institutional goals in higher education.

In 1964 Gross and Grambsch surveyed 68 American universities in an attempt to determine what the goals of universities were, as perceived by administrators and faculty members, and the differences between these perceptions. This study utilized an inventory of 47 goal statements to which faculty and administrators were to attach a relative emphasis of importance. Gross and Grambsch found, in part, that faculty and administrators agreed in their views of the relative emphasis placed on 34 of the 47 goals, with administrators giving higher ratings to 13 perceived goals. This study was published in 1968 under the auspices of the American Council on Education.[82]

Two other groups were active in 1968 studying goals in institutions of higher education. The Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University sent to every college academic dean a survey form containing 64 goal statements asking the deans to indicate to what extent their college "emphasized" each goal. The major finding of this study was that different goals are more emphasized at different types of institutions.[83] The Council for Advancement of

---

[82]Gross and Grambsch, University Goals and Academic Power.

[83]Patricia Nash, "The Goals of Higher Education--An Empirical Assessment," (New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1968). (Mimeographed.)

Small Colleges conducted an analysis of college goals as an aspect of their "Project Student Development". The faculty and administrators of the 13 colleges which participated were asked to rank characteristics of graduates in terms of their perceived importance to the graduates of the respective institutions. Based on the results, these colleges were grouped into four categories: Christ-centered, Intellectual-Social-centered, personal-social-centered, and professional-vocational-centered.[84]

In 1969 the Danforth Foundation, noting that small private colleges had been excluded from the Gross and Grambsch study, financed the administration of the Gross and Grambsch instrument to selected administrators and faculty of fourteen participating colleges. One of the findings of this study was that faculty at small liberal arts colleges felt that the major decision about goals were made by administrators, but generally administrators and faculty perceived the relative importance of goals the same way.[85] The latter part of 1969 saw the development of the preliminary Institutional Goals Inventory by Norm Uhl. Sponsored by the National Laboratory for Higher Education, a preliminary Institutional

---

[84]A. W. Chickering, Education and Identity (San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Boss, 1968).

[85]Danforth News and Notes (St. Louis: Danforth Foundation, November, 1969), Vol. 5, No. 1.

Goals Inventory Instrument was developed. This instrument was developed to provide goal statements which could be utilized to test the value of the Delphi method. With repeated administrations of the inventory, it was found that beliefs about goals did generally converge.[86]

In 1971 Philip Swarr utilized the Gross and Grambsch instrument in the study of four undergraduate institutions in New York. While the Danforth and Gross and Grambsch study utilized ranked scores for analysis, this study utilized mean scores. One of the major findings of this study was that administrators who are perceived to have more power than the faculty were more satisfied than are faculty with the degree of importance they perceive being given goals at their institution.[87]

In 1972 the largest use of the Institutional Goals Inventory yet attempted was undertaken by a Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education in California. This project was conducted by the Educational Testing Service under the direction of Richard E. Peterson. This study of 116 California institutions will serve as a norming study

---

[86]Norman Uhl, Identifying College Goals the Delphi Way, Topical Papers and Reprints, no. 2, (Durham, N. C.: National Laboratory of Higher Education, 1971).

[87]Philip Swarr, "Goals of Colleges and Universities as Perceived and Preferred by Faculty and Administrators", Unpublished report, (Cartland, N. Y.: Office of Institutional Research, State University College, 1971).

for the I.G.I. At this point in time, only a preliminary and incomplete draft of the survey is available, but the report indicated the value of the I.G.I. as an instrument to identify and clarify goal priorities.[88]

Collective bargaining in higher education has also suffered from relatively little investigation. Part of the reason for the lack of study is that collective bargaining did not become a part of higher education until the mid 1960's. Much of the present information on collective bargaining is polemical or descriptive with very little empirical evidence available. Most research conducted to date has investigated the relationship between demographic variables and attitudes toward collective bargaining. The composite that emerges from these studies is that the professor having favorable attitudes toward collective bargaining is a young male, non-protestant of middle-class

---

[88]Richard E. Peterson, Goals for California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 Academic Communities (Berkeley, Calif.: Educational Testing Service, 1972). (A Preliminary and incomplete draft.)

origin with liberal and democratic political preferences.[89]

The literature on collective bargaining abounds with statements that autonomy from external control, institutional research support, teaching load required, amount of financial support, and amount of faculty participation in governance are related to faculty attitudes toward unionization.[90] No research has, however, been completed yet that confirms these statements. Very little has been done in the identification of institutional variables which influence faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining. Institutional

---

[89] See: Richard C. Creal, A Study of the Factors Which Influence the Course of Negotiations Toward Resolution or Impasses In Selected Community Colleges, Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969; James O. Haehn, A Study of Trade Unionism Among State College Professors, Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1969; James O. Haehn, A Survey of Faculty and Administrator Attitudes on Collective Bargaining (Los Angeles: Academic Senate of the California State Colleges, 1970); Robert E. Lane, Faculty Unionism in a California State College, Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967; and John W. Moore, The Attitudes of Pennsylvania Community College Faculty Toward Collective Negotiations in Relation to Their Sense of Power and Sense of Mobility, Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1970.

[90] See for example: William Boyd, "Collective Bargaining in Academe: Causes and Consequences", Liberal Education, 57(Oct., 1971), pp. 300-318; Ralph Brown, "Collective Bargaining for the Faculty", Liberal Education, 56(March, 1970), pp. 75-78; Matthew Finkin, "Collective Bargaining and University Government", A. A. U. P. Bulletin, 57(June, 1971), pp. 149-162; Joseph Garbarino, "Precarious Professors: New Patterns of Representation", Industrial Relations, 10(Feb., 1972), pp. 1-20; Peggy Heim, "Growing Tensions in Academic Administration", North Central Association Quarterly, 42(Winter, 1967), pp. 244-251; Isreal Kugler, "The Union Speaks for Itself", Education Record, 49(Fall, 1969), pp. 414-418.

size, based on F. T. E., was found related to the percentage of union members on a campus in a study conducted in the California State College System. Those institutions with over nine-thousand students were found to have a greater percentage of union members than those with less. This same study indicated that rate of institutional growth did not seem related to the prevalence of faculty unionization. It was also found that those institutions having a more bureaucratic structure had a greater prevalence of faculty union membership.[91]

In the studies related to faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations, the research indicated that those with lower salaries, lower rank, and without tenure who have low opinions of administrative personnel and little sense of power have more favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. The greater dissatisfaction of the faculty with their institutional environment, the greater is the probability of favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations.[92]

---

[91]James O. Haehn, A Study of Trade Unionism Among State College Professors, Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of California, 1969.

[92]See: James O. Haehn, A Study of Trade Unionism Among State College Professors; Marie R. Haus and Marvin B. Sussman, "Professionalization and Unionism", American Behavioral Scientist, 14(March-April, 1971), pp. 525-540; Robert E. Lane, Faculty Unionism in a California State College; and John W. Moore, The Attitudes of Pennsylvania Community College Faculty Toward Collective Negotiations in Relation to Their Sense of Power and Sense of Mobility.

Summary

This chapter gives the theoretical framework upon which the research hypotheses of the study are founded and a summation of related research in the area of collective bargaining and institutional goals.

The concept of institutional goals has been central to the work of such organizational theorists as March, Simon, Perrow, Thompson, and McEwen. March and Simon state that bargaining results when goals are not shared by members of an organization. Perrow notes that goals are shaped by dominant groups in an organization through competition. Thompson and McEwen view goals as constraint sets and bargaining as a decision process in goal selection. Simon notes that widely shared constraint sets can be developed through bargaining.

The study of institutional goals and collective bargaining in higher education is in its infancy. The last decade has seen increased interest in the study of institutional goals. In 1962 Nevitt Sanford noted the need for increased study of institutional goals in higher education. Gross and Grambsch, in 1968, surveyed the faculty of 68 American universities upon their respective institutions goals and determined that there was a great deal of consensus between administrators and faculties on the importance attached to a goal. The Bureau of Applied Research at Columbia University and the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges,

and the Danforth Foundation have also surveyed higher education institutions as to their goals. In 1969 Norman Uhl, sponsored by the National Laboratory for Higher Education, developed a preliminary Institutional Goals Inventory. This instrument has been refined by Richard Peterson and is being developed by the Educational Testing Service for commercial use to assist institutions of higher education in identifying their constituents perceptions of the institutions goals.

Collective bargaining in higher education is of recent vintage. The study of this phenomenon has, to date, been very limited. The studies completed have principally investigated demographic variables and attitudes toward collective bargaining. Most of the literature in the field is polemical. Many of the claimed reasons for collective bargaining have not been investigated empirically. In particular, institutional variables that could influence faculty attitudes toward bargaining have been largely ignored.

The relationship between the perception of institutional goals and attitudes toward collective bargaining is being first examined in this study. It is hoped that further endeavors to identify institutional variables affecting faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining will result from this initial endeavor.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Restatement of the Problem and Hypotheses

The problem of this research is: what are the relationships between faculty members and administrators perceptions of institutional goals and functions and faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining?

More specifically, this study seeks answers to the following questions:

1. What attitudes do university faculty members hold toward collective negotiations?

2. Is the degree of agreement between faculty members and administrators on the importance of perceived institutional goals significantly related to attitudes toward collective negotiations?

3. Is the degree of agreement between faculty members and administrators on the importance of perceived institutional preferred goals significantly related to attitudes toward collective negotiations?

4. Is the degree of agreement between faculty members and administrators on the emphasis given to a perceived function related to attitudes toward collective negotiations?

5. Are certain biographic-career characteristics related to favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations?

The proposition that there is a relationship between faculty and administrators perceptions of institutional goals and functions and faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations is tested through the following null hypotheses:

Ho_1 There is no significant difference of agreement on the perceived importance of institutional goals among administrators, faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations (score high on C.N.S.) and faculty who do not have favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations (score low on C.N.S.) as measured by the Institutional Goals Inventory and the Collective Negotiations Scale.

Ho_2 There is no significant difference of agreement on the importance of preferred institutional goals among administrators, faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations (score high on C.N.S.) and faculty who do not have favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations (score low on C.N.S.) as measured by the Institutional Goals Inventory and the Collective Negotiations Scale.

Ho_3 There is no significant difference of agreement on the perceived emphases given an institutional practice among administrators, faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations (score high on C.N.S.) and faculty who do not have favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations (score low on C.N.S.) as measured by the Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification and the Collective Negotiations Scale.

Ho_4 There is no significant relationship between selected biographic-career characteristics of tenure, age, sex, rank, terminal degree status, university-wide committee membership, faculty senate membership, and faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations as measured by the Collective Negotiations Scale.

Description of the Sample

The population defined for this investigation is the administrators and full-time faculty of a large multi-purpose state university. A sample size of three-hundred full-time faculty was selected. This represents fifty percent of the full-time faculty of the institution sampled during the 1972-1973 academic year. The faculty for the sample were selected on a random basis utilizing a list of random numbers for the selection process. No attempt was made to make the sample proportional to discipline areas or faculty academic ranks, but representatives of every discipline and rank were included among the sample respondents. (See Appendix A) A total of two-hundred-ten faculty members voluntarily responded to the questionnaire. This response represents a 70 percent participation on the part of the randomly selected faculty. The second group sampled was the administrative officers as defined by the University in the faculty register who were at the Directors level and above. Fifty administrators were sampled. A total of 35 administrators responded voluntarily to the questionnaire. This represents a 70 percent participation on the part of

the administrators. The non-respondents were found to be similar to the respondents demographically. (See Appendix A)

Description of the Instruments

Institutional Goals Inventory

The Institutional Goals Inventory was developed for the Educational Testing Service by Richard E. Peterson and Norman Uhl in 1970. The instrument contains twenty scales, each measuring a particular goal area. Each scale has four questions and allows for five responses from "of extremely high importance" to "of no importance". Each question allows for a response in an "is" and "should be" column, thus measures of the perceived importance of a goal area and the preferred importance of a goal area are obtainable.

The twenty scales within the Institutional Goals Inventory are described as follows by the E.T.S.:

> (1) Academic Development. The first kind of institutional goal covered by the I.G.I. has to do with the acquisition of general and specialized knowledge, preparation of students for advanced scholarly study, and maintenance of high intellectual standards on the campus.
>
> (2) Intellectual Orientation. While the first goal area had to do with acquisition of knowledge, this second general goal of instruction relates to an attitude about learning and intellectual work. Likewise, some conception of the scholarly, rational, analytical, inquiring mind has perhaps always been associated with the academy or university. In the I.G.I., Intellectual Orientation means familiarity

with research and problem solving methods, the ability to synthesize knowledge from many sources, the capacity for self-directed learning, and a commitment to life-long learning.

(3) Individual Personal Development. In contrast to most of the goals covered by the I. G. I., this one was set forth and has found acceptance only in roughly the past decade. It was conceived by psychologists and has found its main support among professional psychologists, student personnel people, and other adherents of "humanistic psychology" and the "human potential movement". As defined in the I. G. I., Individual Personal Development means identification by students of personal goals and development of means for achieving them, enhancement of sense of self-worth and self-confidence, self-understanding, and a capacity for open and trusting interpersonal relations.

(4) Humanism/Altruism. More or less explicit discernment of this concept may also be of fairly recent vintage, although variously construed it has long had its place in the catalogues of liberal arts and church-related colleges. It reflects the belief (in many quarters) that a college education should not mean just acquisition of knowledge and skills, but that it should also somehow make students better people--more decent, tolerant, responsible, humane. Labeled Humanism/Altruism, this fundamental ethical stance has been conceived in the I. G. I. as respect for diverse cultures, commitment to working for world peace, consciousness of the important moral issues of the time, and concern about the welfare of man generally.

(5) Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness. Some conception of cultural sophistication and/or artistic appreciation has traditionally been in the panoply of goals of many private liberal arts colleges in America, perhaps especially liberal arts colleges for women. In the I. G. I., the conception entails heightened appreciation of a variety of art forms, required study in the humanities or arts, exposure to forms of non-Western art, and encouragement of active student participation in artistic activities.

(6) Traditional Religiousness. This goal is included

in the I. G. I. in recognition of the fact that a great many colleges and universities in America are explicitly religious in their control, functioning, and goals, while many more retain ties of varying strength with the Roman Catholic Church or, more often, a Protestant denomination. Traditional Religiousness, as conceived in the I. G. I., is meant to mean a religiousness that is orthodox, doctrinal, usually sectarian, and often fundamental--in short, traditional (rather than"secular" or "modern"). As defined in the I. G. I., this goal means educating students in a particular religious heritage, helping them to see the potentialities of full-time religious work, developing students' ability to defend a theological position, and fostering their dedication to serving God in every-day life.

(7) Vocational Preparation. While universities have perhaps always existed in part to train individuals for occupations, this role was made explicit for American public higher education by the Land Grant Act of 1862, and then extended to a broader populace by the public two-year college movement of the 1950's and 1960's. As operationalized in the I. G. I., this goal means offering: specific occupational curricula (as in accounting or nursing), programs geared to emerging career fields, opportunities for retraining or upgrading skills, and assistance to students in career planning. It is important to distinguish between this goal and the next one to be discussed, Advanced Training, which involves graduate-level training for various professional careers.

(8) Advanced Training. This goal, as defined in the I. G. I., can be most readily understood simply as the availability of post-graduate education. The items comprising the goal area have to do with developing/maintaining a strong and comprehensive graduate school, providing programs in the "traditional professions" (law, medicine, etc.), and conducting advanced study in specialized problem areas--as through a multi-disciplinary institute or center.

(9) Research. According to most historians of the matter, the research function in the American univer-

sity was a late 19th century import of the German concept of the university as a center for specialized scientific research and scholarship. Attempting to embrace both "applied" or "problem-centered" research as well as "basic" or "pure" research, the Research goal in the I. G. I. involves doing contract studies for external agencies, conducting basic research in the natural and social sciences, and seeking generally to extend the frontiers of knowledge through scientific research.

(10) Meeting Local Needs. While in times past some institutions of higher learning must certainly have functioned in some way to meet a range of educational needs of local individuals and corporate bodies, the notion of Meeting Local Needs (in the I. G. I.) is drawn primarily from the philosophy of the post-war (American) community college movement. Which is not to say, as will be seen, that this is a goal that four-year institutions cannot share. In the I. G. I. Meeting Local Needs is defined as providing for continuing education for adults, serving as a cultural center for the community, providing trained manpower for local employers, and facilitating student involvement in community-service activities.

(11) Public Service. While the previous goal focused on the local community, this one is conceived more broadly--as bringing to bear of the expertise of the university on a range of public problems of regional, state, or national scope. As it is defined in the I. G. I., Public Service means working with governmental agencies in social and environmental policy formation, committing institutional resources to the solution of major social and environmental problems, training people from disadvantaged communities, and generally being responsive to regional and national priorities in planning educational programs.

(12) Social Egalitarianism has to do with open admissions and meaningful education for all admitted, providing educational experiences relevant to the evolving interests of (1) minority groups and (2) women, and offering remedial work in basic skills.

(13) Social Criticism/Activism. This is a higher

educational goal conception that has been put forth only in the past five years or so. Owing its origin almost entirely to the student protest movement of the 1960's, the central idea of the goal is that the university should be an advocate or instrument for social change. Specifically in the I. G. I., Social Criticism/Activism means providing criticism of prevailing American values, offering ideas for changing social institutions judged to be defective, helping students to learn how to bring about change in American society, and being engaged, as an institution, in working for basic changes in American society.

(14) Freedom. Some of the standard dictionary definitions include: civil liberty, as opposed to subjection to an arbitrary or despotic government; exemption from external control, interference, regulation, etc.; personal liberty, as opposed to bondage or slavery; autonomy; relative self-determination. Freedom, as an institutional goal bearing upon the climate for and process of learning, is seen as relating to all the above definitions. It is seen as embracing both "academic freedom" and "personal freedom," although these distinctions are not always easy to draw. Specifically in the I. G. I., Freedom is defined as protecting the right of faculty to present controversial ideas in the classroom, not preventing students from hearing controversial points of view, placing no restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty or students, and ensuring faculty and students the freedom to choose their own life cycles.

(15) Democratic Governance. The central notion of this goal, as here conceived, is the opportunity for participation--participation in the decisions that affect one's working and learning life. Colleges and universities in America have probably varied a good deal in the degree to which their governance is participatory, depending on factors such as nature of external control (e.g., sectarian), curricular emphases, and personalities of presidents and or other campus leaders. Most all institutions, one surmises, as they expanded during the 1950's and 1960's, experienced a diminution in participatory governance. A reaction set in in the late 1960's,

spurred chiefly by student (power) activists. As defined in the I. G. I., Democratic Governance means decentralized decision-making; arrangements by which students, faculty, administrators, and governing board members can (all) be significantly involved in campus governance, opportunity for individuals to participate in all decisions affecting them, and governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of everyone at the institution.

(16) Community. While community in some sense has perhaps always characterized most academic organizations, especially small ones, the more modern concept of community has risen in only the past decade in reaction to the realities of mass higher education, the "multiversity," and the factionalism and individual self-interest within the university. In the I. G. I., Community is defined as maintaining a climate in which there is faculty commitment to the general welfare of the institution, open and candid communication, open and amicable airing of differences, and mutual trust and respect among students, faculty, and administrators.

(17) Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment means a rich program of cultural events, a campus climate that facilitates student free-time involvement in intellectual and cultural activities, an environment in which students and faculty can easily interact informally, and a reputation as an intellectually exciting campus.

(18) Innovation, as here defined as an institutional goal, means more than simply having recently made some changes at the college; instead the idea is that innovation has become institutionalized, that throughout the campus there is continuous concern to experiment with new ideas for educational practice. In the I. G. I., Innovation means a climate in which continuous innovation is an accepted way of life, it means established procedures for readily initiating curricular or instructional innovations, and, more specifically, it means experimentation with new approaches to (1) individualized instruction and (2) evaluating and grading student performance.

(19) Off-Campus Learning. The elements of the I. G. I. definition of Off-Campus Learning, as a

process goal an institution may pursue, form a kind of scale. They include: (short term) time away from the campus in travel, work-study, VISTA work, etc.; arranging for students to study on several campuses during their undergraduate years; awarding degrees for supervised study off the campus; awarding degrees entirely on the basis of performance on an examination.

(20) Accountability/Efficiency is defined to include use of cost criteria in deciding among program alternatives, concern for program efficiency (not further defined), accountability to funding sources for program effectiveness (not defined), and regular submission of evidence that the institution is achieving stated goals.[93]

The preliminary Institutional Goals Inventory was utilized by Norman Uhl in his study, Identifying Institutional Goals. Utilizing coefficient alpha, a generalization of the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20, to measure internal consistency Uhl reported the reliability found for fourteen of the twenty scales now in the revised Institutional Goals Inventory.[94] These are reported in Table 1. The Goals for California Higher Education study, utilized by the Educational Testing Service for norming of the Institutional Goals Inventory, reported the reliability of the goal area

---

[93]Educational Testing Service, Descriptions of I. G. I. Goal Area (Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972). (Mimeographed)

[94]Norman Uhl, Identifying Institutional Goals (Durham, N. C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1971), pp. 18-20.

scales as reported in Table 2.[95] Uhl reported that support for the validity of the Institutional Goals Inventory was obtained by having five specialists in higher education who had not participated in his study but who had familiarity

Table 1

Reliability of Preliminary I. G. I. Goal Areas

Goal Number	Goal Area	Present Importance	Preferred Importance
2	Intellectual Orientation	.81	.74
3	Individual Personal Development	.89	.77
6	Traditional Religiousness	.97	.95
7	Vocational Preparation	.77	.76
8	Advanced Training	.75	.73
9	Research	.82	.76
10	Meeting Local Needs	.77	.83
11	Public Service	.85	.85
12	Social Egalitarianism	.53	.77
13	Social Criticism/Activism	.73	.69
14	Freedom	.78	.81
15	Democratic Governance	.78	.73
17	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	.79	.61
18	Innovation	.52	.31

with the institutions sampled select the institutions they thought would attach the greatest and least importance to each goal area. This method yielded results consistent with

[95]Norman Uhl, letter to Lynn W. Lindeman, July 6, 1973.

Table 2

RELIABILITY OF I.G.I. GOAL AREAS

Goal Number	Goal Area	Present Importance	Preferred Importance
1	Academic Development	.61	.72
2	Intellectual Orientation	.75	.73
3	Individual Personal Development	.94	.93
4	Humanism/Altruism	.88	.89
5	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	.90	.81
6	Traditional Religiousness	.98	.98
7	Vocational Preparation	.97	.93
8	Advanced Training	.89	.99
9	Research	.94	.96
10	Meeting Local Needs	.91	.93
11	Public Service	.80	.66
12	Social Egalitarianism	.91	.91
13	Social Criticism/Activism	.84	.80
14	Freedom	.99	.91
15	Democratic Governance	.93	.84
16	Community	.97	.76
17	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	.80	.74
18	Innovation	.92	.83
19	Off-Campus Learning	.99	.71
20	Accountability/Efficiency	.75	.77

test results, e.g., church-affiliated institutions placed a greater importance on Religious Orientation than did public institutions.[96] (See Appendix B for specimen instrument)

[96]Norman Uhl, Identifying Institutional Goals, pp. 27-30.

Institutional Functioning Inventory University of Oklahoma Modification

The developmental work on the Institutional Functioning Inventory (I. F. I.) began early in 1967 when a group at Educational Testing Service began discussions with Earl McGrath and his associates at Teachers College, Columbia University, on developing an instrument to measure institutional vitality. By the summer of 1967 a format for the instrument had been established and twelve dimensions of institutional functions identified. In February of 1968 seventy-two college faculty were administered the experimental I. F. I.[97]

The University of Oklahoma Modification of the Institutional Functioning Inventory was developed by revising the Educational Testing Service Institutional Functioning Inventory to conform to the twenty goal areas of the Institutional Goals Inventory, where appropriate to the new scale existing Institutional Functioning Inventory items were used in the Institutional Functioning Inventory University of Oklahoma Modification, (I. F. I.-M). Forty-five new items were written for the I. F. I.-M. Each of the twenty inventory areas of the instrument contain six items

[97]Richard E. Peterson, John A. Centra, Rodney T. Hardnett, and Robert Linn, Institutional Functioning Inventory Preliminary Manual (Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1970), pp. 3-9.

for a total of one-hundred-twenty items.

The first draft of the Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification which was developed by Herbert R. Hengst and Robert L. Lynn, was examined by eight practitioners in higher education to evaluate the appropriateness of each item to its scale. As a result, the first draft was modified. This instrument is designed to elicit perceptions of what institutional functions are.

The twenty scales within the Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification were constructed to correspond to the twenty goal areas of the Institutional Goals Inventory. The I.F.I.-M. function areas are as follows:

1. Academic Development
2. Intellectual Orientation
3. Individual Personal Development
4. Humanism/Altruism
5. Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness
6. Traditional Religiousness
7. Vocational Preparation
8. Advanced Training
9. Research
10. Meeting Local Needs
11. Public Service
12. Social Egalitarianism
13. Social Criticism/Activism
14. Freedom
15. Democratic Governance
16. Community
17. Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment
18. Innovation
19. Off-Campus Learning
20. Accountability/Efficiency

A reliability test was conducted on the I.F.I.-M. during the Spring of 1973. A sample of thirty-eight persons, including students, faculty and administrators, was utilized. The test-retest reliability coefficients are reported in Table 3. (See Appendix C for specimen instrument.)

Table 3

I.F.I.-M. Test-Retest Reliability Coefficients

Function Number	Function Area	Reliability Coefficients
1	Academic Development	.64
2	Intellectual Orientation	.71
3	Individual Personal Development	.69
4	Humanism/Altruism	.61
5	Cultural Aesthetic Awareness	.65
6	Traditional Religiousness	.83
7	Vocational Preparation	.52
8	Advanced Training	.37
9	Research	.56
10	Meeting Local Needs	.73
11	Public Service	.68
12	Social Egalitarianism	.74
13	Social Criticism/Activism	.77
14	Freedom	.73
15	Democratic Governance	.84
16	Community	.79
17	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	.68
18	Innovation	.88
19	Off-Campus Learning	.73
20	Accountability/Efficiency	.63

Collective Negotiations Scale

The Collective Negotiations Scale, referred to as the C. N. Scale, was used to measure attitudes toward the use of collective negotiations in higher education. The C. N. Scale is a modification of a scale developed by Patrick Carlton for measuring the attitudes of North Carolina teachers toward collective negotiations.[98]

Carlton's scale was a thirty item, Likert-type scale designed to elicit attitudes toward collective negotiations on the part of teachers. The scale was based on three assumptions: (1) that attitudes are quantitatively identifiable and can therefore be assigned score values; (2) that attitudes lie along a continuum from strongly disfavor to equally strong favor; (3) that collective negotiations is made up of at least two complimentary facets, the negotiations process, and sufficient coercive force to assure near equality of the parties involved. These were assumed to be non-separable characteristics.[99]

Carlton reported that 104 items were initially written, expressing various opinions about collective negotiations. These items were then submitted to a panel

---

[98]Patrick Carlton, Attitudes of Certificated Instructional Personnel in North Carolina Toward Questions Concerning Collective Negotiations and Sanctions, Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1966.

[99]Ibid., p. 68

of one-hundred educators who wrote a critical analysis of them. An item analysis of the results was performed and the thirty items with the most discriminatory power were selected for the final scale. The split-half reliability of Carlton's scale was reported to be .84.

In 1970 John W. Moore modified the Carlton scale for use with higher education faculty.[100] The modification was accomplished primarily through word substitution, such as using the word "faculty" to replace the word "teacher", "college" to replace "school", etc. Coefficient alpha, a measure of internal consistency for the C. N. Scale as modified, was computed by Moore as an index of reliability of the scale. The process is equivalent to the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 method for computing the reliability of a scale. The reliability coefficient was reported to be .92 for the pilot sample with a standard error of 4.39. Moore also performed an item analysis and factor analysis. These analyses lead to the elimination of five items from the original scale. Five new items were constructed and added to the remaining twenty-five items. A panel of higher education students attested to the face validity of the new

---

[100]John W. Moore, The Attitudes of Pennsylvania Community College Faculty Toward Collective Negotiations in Relation to Their Sense of Power and Sense of Mobility.

scale. The reliability index, coefficient alpha, was again computed on the new C.N. Scale and found to be .96 and the standard error of measurement was 4.50. The C.N. Scale, as modified by Moore, was utilized in this study to measure attitudes toward collective negotiations. (See Appendix D for specimen instrument.)

Procedure for Collection of Data.

Permission to conduct the study was requested from the President and the Chairman of the Faculty Senate of the institution sampled. After a review of the prospectus of this study, approval and endorsement was granted by the President and the Chairman of the Faculty Senate.

The first phase in data collection was to obtain a current listing of faculty and administrative officers and staff of the University. From this list, three-hundred faculty were identified utilizing a table of random numbers. Proceeding from the first faculty member selected at random through the list of randomly selected faculty members, each individual was contacted via phone to confirm their current status and availability as a sample subject.

The second phase in the data collection process involved sending a letter explaining the purpose of the study and the three questionnaires to the randomly selected sample of faculty and the identified administrative officers

and staff in April of 1973. One follow-up letter was sent during May of 1973 to faculty members and administrators who had not responded to the earlier request. (See Appendix E for specimen letters.)

Statistical Methodology

The principle interest of the study is the relationship between attitudes toward collective negotiations and perception of institutional goals, preferred institutional goals and institutional functions. A four stage analysis of the data was necessitated.

The first stage of analysis dealt with the data obtained from the Collective Negotiations Scale, and had for its purpose the determination of group one and group three to be compared in the study. Group one were faculty having favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, scoring one standard deviation above the mean on the Collective Negotiations Scale. Group three were those faculty having unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, scoring one standard deviation below the mean on the Collective Negotiations Scale. Group two was designated to be the administrator respondents. One standard deviation above and below the mean on the Collective Negotiations Scale was selected to determine group one and three membership so as to maximize group

differences based on the Collective Negotiations Scale scores. To compute the total score for each respondent, the mean score of the respondents, and the standard deviation of the respondents on the Collective Negotiations Scale, the University of California Biomedical Program, BMD 01D, was utilized.[101] This program computes simple averages and measures of dispersion. The following measures were computed by this program on the Collective Negotiations Scale: mean, variance, standard deviation, standard error of mean, and range. This program, and all other computer programs used in this study, are on file at the Merrick Computer Center of the University of Oklahoma.

The second stage of analysis dealt with data obtained by the Institutional Goals Inventory. A multiple analysis of variance was computed for the three groups across all goal areas of the instrument. This procedure was used to determine if there was a systematic difference in variance among the three groups of the sample over the twenty goal areas in both the "is" and "should be" components of the instrument. If systematic variance is found, a one-way analysis of variance will be computed on each goal scale to determine on what goal scales the variance

---

[101]W. J. Dixon, (ed.), Biomedical Computer Program (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1970), pp. 42-49.

occurred. Individual comparisons will then be computed, using the Scheffé method, on those goal scales where significant differences were found, in order to determine which group was varying. This procedure provides information as to whether or not there was significant group differences in the perception of the importance attached to perceived institutional goals, "is" component of the instrument, and preferred institutional goals, "should be" component of the instrument.

The University of Oklahoma Multiple Analysis of Variance Program was utilized for some of the above computations.[102] This program performs univariate and multivariate analysis of variance, analysis of covariance, and of regression. It provides an exact solution in the orthogonal or non-orthogonal case. Options in the program include single or multiple degree of freedom contrasts in the main effects or interactions, transformations of variables, and orthogonal polynomial contrasts with equal or unequally spared points. The program alsc provides for reanalysis with different criteria, covariates, contrasts, and models. The following measures were computed by this program for the Institutional Goals Inventory responses for

---

[102] Elliot Cramer and L. L. Thurston, O. U. Manova Program (Chapel Hill, N.C.: Psychometric Laboratory, University of North Carolina, n.d.).

both the "is" and "should be" components of the instrument: means and standard deviations for each group on each scale, multiple anova, a test of significance using approximate F test for multivariate analysis of variance, Univariate F tests over all goal scales, the sum of the squares, degrees of freedom, mean squares within, and significance level. The Scheffé method for unequal cells was hand computed for those goal scales where significant group variance was found.

The third stage of analysis was to determine if there were significant group differences on the perceived emphasis placed on institutional functions. The same procedures, computer programs, and computations were used in this stage as in the previous stage of analysis on the data obtained from the Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification.

The fourth stage of analysis dealt with data obtained from the administration of the Collective Negotiations Scale and the career-demographic information on sample members. This stage determined if there was any significant relationship between attitudes toward collective negotiations and the selected demographic variables of tenure, age, sex, rank, university-wide committee membership, faculty senate membership and terminal degree status.

The relationship between the demographic variables and the Collective Negotiations Scale was computed by utilizing the Pierson Product Moment correlation. The University of California Biomedical Program, BMD 03D, was utilized for correlation coefficient computation.[103]

A simple percentage analysis of the response patterns to the Collective Negotiations Scale was completed.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to present a description of the manner in which the problem and hypotheses were investigated. The problem elements were identified as faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations and their perceptions of institutional goals, preferred institutional goals, and institutional functions.

Three instruments were utilized to collect data on the variables, the Institutional Goals Inventory, the Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification, and the Collective Negotiations Scale. The instruments were distributed to a randomly selected sample of three-hundred faculty and fifty administrators. Seventy percent of the sample responded.

---

[103]Dixon, Biomedical Computer Program, pp. 60-66.

The faculty respondents were dichotomized based on their Collective Negotiations Scale scores. The two faculty groups were characterized as those faculty having favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, and those faculty having unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. The two faculty groups and the administrator group were then compared on the basis of their scores on the Institutional Goals Inventory and the Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification.

A multiple analysis of variance was computed for the three groups across all goal and function scales of the instruments to determine if there was systematic difference in variance among the three groups. If systematic variance is found, a one-way analysis of variance will be computed on each goal and function scale to determine on what scales significant variance occurred. The Scheffé method will be utilized for those scale areas where significant variance was found, to determine how the groups were varying. A Pierson Product Moment correlation was computed to determine the relationship between the selected demographic variables of the respondent faculty and their attitudes toward collective negotiations, based on Collective Negotiations Scale scores. A simple analysis of

response patterns to the Collective Negotiations Scale was completed. The above analytical procedures provided the data for testing the hypotheses of the study.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The findings and statistical analyses given in this chapter is based upon data obtained from the administration of: (1) the Collective Negotiations Scale; (2) the Institutional Goals Inventory; and (3) the Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification.

Collective Negotiations Scale scores were utilized to divide and dichotomize the faculty respondents into two groups. Those faculty scoring one standard deviation above the mean on the C.N.S. were designated as having favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. Those faculty scoring one standard deviation below the mean on the C.N.S. were designated as having unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. (See Table 4)

The three groups, (1) those faculty having favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, (2) administrators, (3) those faculty having unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotions, constituted the three test groups. The groups were compared on the data obtained from the administration of the Institutional Goals Inventory for both the perceived goal and preferred goal components, and

the Institutional Functioning Inventory. The data obtained was arranged so that the statistical analyses described in Chapter III could be performed. All hypotheses were tested by using the Approximate F Test for multiple variate analysis of variance, or the Pierson Product Moment Correlation coefficient. The Approximate F Test for multiple variate analysis of variance was used to test Ho_1, Ho_2, and Ho_3. The Pierson Product Moment Correlation coefficient was used to test Ho_4. A confidence level of 0.05 was used throughout to test the significance of difference. The actual levels of significance achieved are reported in the appropriate tables.

Table 4

ADMINISTRATOR AND FACULTY GROUPS AS DEFINED BY THE COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS SCALE

GROUP	$\bar{x}$	SD	+1 SD	-1 SD
Group Two-Administrators	73.76	16.26	90.02	57.50
All Respondent Faculty	79.20	17.40	96.60	61.80
Group One- Faculty Scoring +1 SD	106.41	5.33	111.74	101.08
Group Three- Faculty Scoring -1 SD	58.50	12.11	70.61	46.39

The first null hypothesis was: There is no significant difference of agreement on the perceived importance of institutional goals among administrators, faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, and

favulty who do not have favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations as measured by the Collective Negotiations Scale. The testing of this hypothesis was accomplished through comparing the test groups on the basis of their scores on the perceived goals component of the Institutional Goals Inventory. Utilizing the Approximate F Test to test significance, the hypothesis was significant at the .001 level, and thus rejected. (See Table 5) The three groups differed significantly in their perceptions of the importance

Table 5

APPROXIMATE F TEST RESULTS FOR THE INSTITUTIONAL GOALS INVENTORY: PERCEIVED GOALS

F	D.F. Hyp.	D.F. Err.	P Less Than
2.136	40	146	.001

of institutional goals. Table 6 provides a comparison of the grand mean and group means for each goal area of the instrument.

Because a significant difference was found among the groups on their perceptions of the importance attached to institutional goals, Univariate F Tests were computed to determine over which of the twenty goal area scales significant differences occurred. It was found that there were significant differences among the groups at the .05 level

TABLE 6

COMPARISONS OF GROUP MEANS AND GRAND MEANS FOR PERCEIVED GOAL COMPONENTS OF THE I.G.I.

	Goal Area	Faculty With Favorable Attitudes	Admin-istrators	Faculty With Unfavorable Attitudes	Grand $\bar{x}$	Grand S. D.
1	Academic Development	3.040	3.456	3.117	3.213	.636
2	Intellectial Orientation	2.478	2.904	2.733	2.711	.731
3	Individual Personal Development	2.309	2.436	2.558	2.430	.624
4	Humanism/Altruism	2.113	2.537	2.367	2.345	.676
5	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	2.395	2.566	2.492	2.487	.611
6	Traditional Religiousness	1.387	1.368	1.475	1.408	.532
7	Vocational Preparation	2.694	2.875	2.817	2.797	.581
8	Advanced Training	3.282	3.794	3.417	3.508	.583
9	Research	2.968	3.338	3.133	3.153	.602
10	Meeting Social Needs	2.863	2.934	2.892	2.898	.601
11	Public Service	2.282	2.522	2.450	2.421	.633
12	Social Egalitarianism	2.185	2.078	2.483	2.241	.658
13	Social Criticism/Activism	2.024	2.346	2.400	2.258	.693
14	Freedom	2.621	3.309	3.217	3.055	.816
15	Democratic Governance	2.685	3.257	2.967	2.979	.785
16	Community	2.685	3.169	3.108	2.992	.767
17	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	2.452	2.745	2.683	2.630	.617
18	Innovation	2.411	2.449	2.592	2.482	.623
19	Off-Campus Learning	2.137	1.941	1.975	2.016	.553
20	Accountability/Efficiency	2.927	2.919	3.011	2.982	.712

of confidence over eight goal areas: Academic Development, Humanism/Altruism, Advanced Training, Social Egalitarianism, Research, Freedom, Democratic Governance, and Community. The Univariate F Test findings are reported in Table 7.

Table 7

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS INVENTORY F TEST RESULTS

	Goal Area	F(2,29)	Mean SQ	P Less Than
1	Academic Development	4.243	1.604	.017*
2	Intellectual Orientation	2.883	1.482	.061
3	Individual Personal Development	1.225	0.474	.299
4	Humanism/Altruism	3.367	1.467	.039*
5	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	0.632	0.238	.534
6	Traditional Religious-ness	0.354	0.102	.703
7	Vocational Preparation	0.810	0.275	.448
8	Advanced Training	7.768	2.307	.001*
9	Research	3.244	1.121	.044*
10	Meeting Local Needs	0.113	0.041	.893
11	Public Service	1.215	0.485	.301
12	Social Egalitarianism	3.345	1.379	.040*
13	Social Criticism/ Activism	2.763	1.280	.068
14	Freedom	7.532	4.407	.001*
15	Democratic Governance	4.639	2.655	.012*
16	Community	3.961	2.193	.022*
17	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	2.042	0.761	.136
18	Innovation	0.708	0.277	.495
19	Off-Campus Learning	1.141	0.348	.324
20	Accountability/ Efficiency	0.132	0.080	.877

*Significant at .05 level

On those goal area scales where the Univariate F test indicated a significant difference among the groups,

a Scheffé Post Hoc comparison test was conducted to determine which of the three groups was differing significantly from each other. Table 8 summarizes the Scheffé test findings indicating in which group comparisons, the critical value was exceeded. Group One, those faculty having favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, were found to score lower than group two, the administrators, on the Institutional Goals Inventory perceived goals component over seven goal area scales: Academic Development, Humanism/Altruism, Advanced Training, Research, Freedom, Democratic Governance, and Community. Group One scored lower than Group Three, those faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, on only one goal area scale, that of freedom.

Table 8

FINDINGS OF SCHEFFÉ TEST
PERCEIVED GOAL AREA COMPARISONS BETWEEN GROUPS

Goal Area	1<2	1<3	2<1	2<3	3<1	3<2
Academic Development	x					
Humanism/Altruism	x					
Advanced Training	x					x
Research	x					
Social Egalitarianism				x		
Freedom	x	x				
Democratic Governance	x					
Community	x					

Group One: Those faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations
Group Two: Administrators
Group Three: Those faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations

The administrator group scored lower than Group Three on the Social Egalitarianism scale, but higher than Group One on the Advanced Training Scale.

Faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations were found to vary significantly from administrators, while those faculty who have unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations did not vary significantly in their perception of the importance attached to an institutional goal area. In every instance, Group One scored lower than Group Two on the scales tested. Faculty who favor collective negotiations do not perceive the university to be placing as great an emphasis on six of the goal areas tested as do the administrator group.

The second null hypothesis was: There is no significant difference of agreement on the importance of preferred institutional goals among administrators, faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, and faculty who do not have favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations as measured by the Institutional Goals Inventory and the Collective Negotiations Scale. The testing of this hypothesis was accomplished through comparing the test groups on the basis of their scores on the preferred goals component, (should be component), of the Institutional Goals Inventory. The Approximate F Test for significance

was used, the hypothesis was significant at the .002 level, and thus was rejected. (See Table 9) The three groups differed significantly in their perception of the importance that should be attached to institutional goals. Table 10 provides a comparison of the grand mean and group means for each goal area of the preferred goal component of the instrument.

Table 9

APPROXIMATE F TEST RESULTS FOR THE INSTITUTIONAL GOALS INVENTORY: PREFERRED GOALS

F	D.F.Hyp.	D.F.Err.	P Less Than
1.937	40.	146	.002

Because a significant difference was found among the groups on their perception of the importance that should be attached to an institutional goal, Univariate F Tests were computed to determine over which of the twenty goal area scales significant differences occurred. It was found that there were significant differences among the groups at the .05 level of confidence over eight goal areas: Traditional Religiousness, Vocational Preparation, Social Criticism/Activism, Freedom, Democratic Governance, Innovation, Off-Campus Learning, and Accountability/Efficiency. The Univariate F Test findings are reported in Table 11.

On those goal area scales where the Univeriate F

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF GROUP MEANS AND GRAND MEAN FOR THE PREFERRED GOAL COMPONENTS OF THE I.G.I.

	Goal Area	Faculty With Favorable Attitudes	Adminis-trators	Faculty With Unfavorable Attitudes	Grand $\bar{x}$	Grand S.D.
1	Academic Development	3.903	3.941	3.942	3.929	.545
2	Intellectual Orientation	4.457	4.412	4.225	4.367	.527
3	Individual Persona. Development	3.798	3.978	3.725	3.839	.899
4	Humanism/Altruism	3.815	3.463	3.267	3.553	.940
5	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	3.271	3.250	2.997	3.210	.693
6	Traditional Religiousness	1.263	1.735	1.917	1.656	.866
7	Vocational Preparation	3.347	3.831	3.683	3.626	.761
8	Advanced Training	3.839	4.081	3.967	3.966	.594
9	Research	3.798	3.779	3.658	3.747	.672
10	Meeting Local Needs	3.210	3.603	3.342	3.392	.769
11	Public Service	3.540	3.588	3.175	3.442	.782
12	Social Egalitarianism	2.874	2.971	2.508	2.793	.824
13	Social Criticism/Activism	3.570	3.221	2.800	3.202	.999
14	Freedom	4.118	3.551	3.208	3.615	.903
15	Democratic Governance	4.048	3.654	3.358	3.689	.799
16	Community	4.185	4.191	4.225	4.200	.550
17	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	3.911	4.066	4.008	3.997	.591
18	Innovation	3.723	3.882	3.392	3.675	.706
19	Off-Campus Learning	2.919	2.985	2.358	2.766	.807
20	Accountability/Efficiency	3.105	3.816	3.619	3.556	.759

Table 11

I.G.I.-PREFERRED GOALS COMPONENT F TEST RESULTS

Goal Area		F(2,29)	Mean SQ	P Less Than
1	Academic Development	0.050	0.015	.951
2	Intellectual Orientation	1.681	0.461	.192
3	Individual Personal Development	0.674	0.549	.512
4	Humanism/Altruism	2.417	2.361	.095
5	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	1.229	0.714	.297
6	Traditional Religiousness	4.924	3.503	.009*
7	Vocational Preparation	3.589	1.971	.032*
8	Advanced Training	1.357	0.476	.263
9	Research	0.386	0.177	.681
10	Meeting Local Needs	2.275	1.310	.109
11	Public Service	2.677	1.583	.074
12	Social Egalitarianism	2.832	1.852	.064
13	Social Criticism/Activism	4.915	4.525	.009*
14	Freedom	9.524	6.574	.001*
15	Democratic Governance	6.401	3.662	.002*
16	Community	0.045	0.014	.956
17	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	0.560	0.197	.573
18	Innovation	4.225	1.971	.018*
19	Off-Campus Learning	6.275	3.675	.003*
20	Accountability/Efficiency	6.891	4.311	.002*

*Significant at .05 level

test indicated a significant difference among the groups, a Scheffé Post Hoc Comparisons test was conducted to determine which of the three groups was differing from each other significantly. Table 12 summarizes the Scheffé test findings, indicating on what group comparisons the critical value was exceeded.

Group One, those faculty having favorable attitudes

Table 12

FINDINGS OF SCHEFFÉ TEST PREFERRED GOAL AREA COMPARISONS BETWEEN GROUPS

Goal Area	1<2	1<3	2<1	2<3	3<1	3<2
Traditional Religiousness		x				
Vocational Preparation	x					
Social Criticism/ Activism					x	
Freedom			x		x	
Democratic Governance					x	
Innovation						x
Off-Campus Learning					x	x
Accountability/ Efficiency	x	x				

Group One: Faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations
Group Two: Administrators
Group Three: Faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations

toward collective negotiations were found to score higher than Group Three, those faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, on four goal area scales: Social Criticism/Activism, Freedom, Democratic Governance, and Off-Campus Learning. Those with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations felt the institution should be placing greater emphasis on the goal areas of Social Criticism/Activism, Freedom, Democratic Governance, and Off-Campus Learning compared to the group with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. Group One scored

lower than Group Three on two goal scale areas: Traditional Religiousness and Accountability/Efficiency. Those who do not have favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations desired a greater emphasis on the institutional goal areas of Traditional Religiousness and Accountability/Efficiency than did those faculty favoring collective negotiations. Group Two, administrators, also desired that the goal area of Accountability/Efficiency be given greater emphasis than did Group One. On the one goal area scale of Accountability/Efficiency both the administrator group and unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations group felt the goal should receive greater emphasis than did those faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. It is also interesting to note that on the goal scale area of Freedom those faculty favoring collective negotiations felt that it should be accorded greater emphasis than did either the administrator group or faculty group with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations.

While significant difference on what importance should be attached to institutional goals occurred nine times between Groups One and Two and Groups One and Three, differences between Groups Two and Three occurred only twice. The faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations scored lower than the administrator

group on the goal scale areas of Innovation and Off-Campus Learning. They did not feel that these areas should be given as great an emphasis as did the administrator group.

The third null hypothesis was: There is no significant difference of agreement on the perceived emphasis given an institutional practice among administrators, faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations and faculty who do not have favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations as measured by the Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification and the Collective Negotiations Scale. The testing of this hypothesis was accomplished through comparison of the test groups on the basis of their scores on the University of Oklahoma Modification of the Institutional Functioning Inventory. The Approximate F Test for significance was used, the hypothesis was significant at the .001 level and thus rejected. (See Table 13) The three groups differed significantly in their perception of the degree to which the

Table 13

APPROXIMATE F TEST RESULTS FOR THE INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY

F	D.F. Hyp.	D.F. Err.	P Less Than
2.185	40.	146.	.001

institution was performing in the function areas tested. Table 14 provides a comparison of the grand mean and group means for each function area of the University of Oklahoma Modification of the Institutional Functioning Inventory.

Because a significant difference was found among the groups on their perception of the emphasis being given the institutional functions tested, Univariate F Tests were computed to determine over which of the twenty functions area scales significant differences occurred. It was found that there were significant differences among the groups at the .05 level of confidence over fourteen function areas: Academic Development, Intellectual Orientation, Humanism/Altruism, Traditional Religiousness, Advanced Training, Public Service, Social Egalitarianism, Social Criticism/Activism, Freedom, Democratic Governance, Community, Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment, Innovation, and Accountability/Efficiency. The Univariate F Test findings are reported in Table 15.

On those function area scales where the Univariate F Test indicated a significant difference among the groups, a Scheffé Post Hoc Comparison Test was conducted to determine which of the three groups were differing significantly from each other. Table 16 summarizes the Scheffé test findings, indicating on what group comparisons the critical value was exceeded.

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF GROUP MEANS AND GRAND MEAN FOR THE INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY-UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA MODIFICATION

	Function Area	Faculty With Favorable Attitudes	Administrators	Faculty With Unfavorable Attitudes	Grand $\bar{x}$	Grand S.D.
1	Academic Development	2.399	2.617	2.741	2.585	.380
2	Intellectual Orientation	2.308	2.525	2.557	2.464	.337
3	Individual Personal Development	2.759	2.730	2.937	2.805	.389
4	Humanism/Altruism	2.505	2.732	2.773	2.671	.348
5	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	3.674	3.766	3.732	3.725	.420
6.	Traditional Religiousness	1.792	1.932	2.256	1.988	.551
7	Vocational Preparation	3.163	3.437	3.441	3.349	.613
8	Advanced Training	3.028	3.100	3.334	3.150	.508
9	Research	2.636	2.955	2.956	2.851	.635
10	Meeting Local Needs	3.105	3.210	3.468	3.257	.729
11	Public Service	2.729	3.133	3.235	3.033	.637
12	Social Egalitarianism	2.975	3.182	3.540	3.228	.587
13	Social Criticism/Activism	2.353	2.679	2.707	2.581	.534
14	Freedom	2.577	2.915	2.870	2.791	.575
15	Democratic Governance	2.228	2.761	2.686	2.563	.502
16	Community	2.203	2.683	2.697	2.585	.528
17	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	2.740	3.086	3.125	2.985	.506
18	Innovation	1.917	2.447	2.620	2.379	.545
19	Off-Campus Learning	2.575	2.387	2.514	2.488	.576
20	Accountability/Efficiency	2.417	2.509	2.847	2.586	.668

Table 15

INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY-UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA MODIFICATION F TEST RESULTS

	Function Area	F(2,29)	Mean SQ	P Less Than
1	Academic Development	7.161	0.915	.001*
2	Intellectual Orientation	5.484	0.569	.006*
3	Individual Personal Development	2.674	0.391	.074
4	Humanism/Altruism	5.905	0.647	.004*
5	Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	0.389	0.070	.679
6	Traditional Religiousness	6.347	1.732	.003*
7	Vocational Preparation	2.173	0.797	.120
8	Advanced Training	3.165	0.781	.047*
9	Research	2.754	1.069	.069
10	Meeting Local Needs	2.048	1.066	.135
11	Public Service	6.045	2.212	.003*
12	Social Egalitarianism	8.352	2.489	.001*
13	Social Criticism/Activism	4.574	1.212	.013*
14	Freedom	3.382	1.064	.038*
15	Democratic Governance	13.125	2.634	.001*
16	Community	6.730	2.473	.002*
17	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	6.050	1.401	.003*
18	Innovation	12.649	4.141	.001*
19	Off-Campus Learning	0.902	0.300	.409
20	Accountability/Efficiency	3.719	1.507	.028*

*Significant at .05 level

Group One, those faculty having favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations were found to score significantly lower than the administrative group in nine of the function areas. Group One also scored lower than Group Three, those faculty having unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, on thirteen of the function areas. Only on one function area did the administrative group and

Table 16

FINDINGS OF SCHEFFÉ TEST FUNCTION AREA COMPARISONS BETWEEN GROUPS

Function Area	1<2	1<3	2<1	2<3	3<1	3<2
Academic Development		x				
Intellectual Orientation	x	x				
Humanism/Altruism	x	x				
Traditional Religiousness	x	x				
Advanced Training		x				
Public Service	x	x				
Social Egalitarianism		x		x		
Social Criticism/ Activism		x				
Freedom	x					
Democratic Governance	x	x				
Community	x	x				
Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	x	x				
Innovation	x	x				
Accountability/ Efficiency		x				

Group One: Faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations
Group Two: Administrators
Group Three: Faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations

faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations differ significantly, on the Social Egalitarianism scale the administrators scored lower.

While the administrator group and faculty group with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations did not differ significantly in their perception of the emphasis being given twelve of the thirteen institutional

function areas tested, the faculty group with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations did differ significantly. In every case the faculty group with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations scored lower than the other two groups. The faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations did not feel that the institutional function areas of Academic Development, Intellectual Orientation, Humanism/Altruism, Traditional Religiousness, Advanced Training, Public Service, Social Egalitarianism, Social Criticism/Activism, Freedom, Democratic Governance, Community, Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment, Innovation, and Accountability/Efficiency were being given as great an emphasis as perceived by the administrator and faculty group with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations.

The fourth null hypothesis was: There is no significant relationship between the selected biographic-career characteristics of tenure, age, sex, rank, university-wide committee membership, faculty senate membership, terminal degree status and attitudes toward collective negotiations as measured by the Collective Negotiations Scale. The testing of this hypothesis was accomplished through comparison of test scores of all faculty respondents on the

Collective Negotiations Scale on the basis of the selected biographic-career variables. The Pierson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to test the significance at the .05 level of confidence, the hypothesis was not rejected. (See Table 17)

TABLE 17

PIERSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION RESULTS

Variable	r Correlation	r required at .05 level
1 Age	-.068	.19
2 Rank	-.055	.19
3 Tenure	-.0733	.19
4 Terminal Degree Status	-.066	.19
5 Sex	+.075	.19
6 Faculty Senate Membership	+.084	.19
7 University-wide Committee Membership	+.046	.19

While age, rank, tenure, and terminal degree status was inversely related to collective negotiations scores, the correlation level did not reach significance. Male faculty tended to score lower than female faculty on the collective negotiations scale, but a significant correlation was not attained. The faculty who are not members of any university-wide committees and those faculty who are not members of the faculty senate tended to score higher than other faculty who were members on the Collective Negotiations Scale, but a

significant correlation level was not reached. None of the biographic-career variables tested was found significantly related to attitudes toward collective negotiations as measured by the Collective Negotiations Scale.

One of the purposes of this study was to assess the general attitude orientation of university faculty toward collective negotiations. In order to determine the receptiveness of university faculty to the use of collective negotiations in higher education, an analysis of the respondents to selected items on the Collective Negotiations Scale was undertaken.

The items were organized into three categories for the purpose of analysis: (1) items pertaining to attitudes toward collective action; (2) items pertaining to attitudes toward the use of sanctions; and (3) items pertaining to attitudes toward faculty withholding their services. The categorizations above were made on the basis of the assumption that they represent increasing levels of militancy. For purposes of clearer discussion of the faculty response patterns to the Collective Negotiations Scale, the two agreement responses of the instrument have been collapsed into one category, "agreement", and the two disagreement responses of the instrument into one category, "disagreement".

The faculty percentages of responses to each response

choice for the 15 items in the collective action category are reported in Table 18. An analysis of the faculty responses to the items indicate that university faculty are favorable disposed toward collective negotiations. Approximately 80 percent agreed that faculty should be able to organize and bargain collectively. (Item 5) Over 70 percent agreed that collective negotiations is an effective way for faculty to participate in determining the conditions of their employment. (Item 1) Fifty percent of the faculty sampled agreed that collective negotiations is a good way to unite the teaching profession into a powerful political body, (Item 16) and 61 percent felt that collective negotiations could bring greater order to education. (Item 30)

Approximately 69 percent of the faculty sampled agreed that collective negotiations is an effective way to limit the unilateral authority of the governing board, (Item 2) while only approximately 15 percent agreed that collective negotiations is an infringement of the authority of the governing board. (Item 15) Only about 37 percent thought that collectively negotiated agreements placed undesirable restrictions on the administration. (Item 17)

Approximately 47 percent agreed that collective negotiations is primarily a coercive technique that will have detrimental effects on higher education. (Item 7) A

TABLE 18

FACULTY PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSE CHOICE FOR ITEMS OF THE COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS SCALE CATEGORIZED AS MEASURES OF ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLECTIVE ACTION

Item Number		Percentages			
		AS	A	D	DS
1.	I think collective negotiations is an effective way for faculty to participate in determining the conditions of their employment.	23.5	47.1	21.1	8.3
2.	I think collective negotiations is an effective way for faculty to limit the unilateral authority of the governing board.	24.9	43.9	25.9	5.3
5.	Faculty members should be able to organize freely and to bargain collectively in their working conditions.	30.4	50.0	13.2	6.4
7.	I feel that collective negotiations is primarily a coercive technique that will have detrimental effects on higher education.	16.6	20.5	46.3	16.6
9.	I believe that militant faculty organizations are made up of a large number of malcontents and misfits.	13.2	30.9	38.7	17.2
11.	I feel that the good faculty members can always get the salary they need without resorting to collective negotiations.	4.9	29.3	40.5	25.3
12.	I believe that collective bargaining alias collective negotiations, is beneath the the dignity of college faculty members.	5.4	16.6	53.7	24.3

TABLE 18 (continued)

15.	I feel that collective negotiations is an infringement on the authority of the governing board and should be resisted.	2.5	12.7	63.7	21.1
16.	I think collective negotiations is a good way to unite the teaching profession into a powerful political body.	6.9	43.6	38.2	11.3
17.	I think that collectively negotiated written labor agreements place undesirable restrictions on the administration.	1.3	30.9	52.0	10.7
18.	I think collective negotiations can provide a vehicle whereby faculty members gain greater on-the-job dignity and independence in performing their functions.	10.2	44.9	30.7	14.2
19.	I believe the many leaders in the drive for collective negotiations are power seekers who do not have the best interests of education at heart.	8.4	36.5	43.8	11.3
20.	The local faculty organization should seek to regulate standards for hiring of new faculty members.	10.2	47.8	32.2	9.8
28.	I feel that it is unwise to establish educational policies and practices through collective negotiations.	12.7	28.3	50.7	8.3
30.	I think collective negotiations can bring greater order and system to education.	8.8	52.2	28.3	10.7

smaller number, 41 percent, agreed that it was unwise to establish educational policies and practices through collective negotiations. (Item 28)

Fifty-five percent agreed that collective negotiations can provide a vehicle where faculty can gain greater on-the-job dignity and independence. (Item 18) Only 22 percent agreed that collective negotiations is below the dignity of faculty members. (Item 12) A larger number, 34 percent, agreed that good faculty members can always get the salary they need without resorting to collective negotiations. (Item 11)

Faculty responses to items pertaining to the utilization of sanctions are reported in Table 19. Faculty responses to the items in the use of sanctions category seem to indicate that university faculty have favorable attitudes toward the use of a number of forms of sanctions. Over 73 percent agreed that faculty have a right to impose sanctions on governing boards under certain circumstances. (Item 21) Approximately 86 percent agreed that when a governing board denies the requests of the faculty, faculty have a right to present those facts to the public and their professional associates. (Item 29) Over 78 percent agreed that faculty organizations at local, state, and national levels should publicize unfair practices by a governing board through various mass media. (Item 6)

TABLE 19

FACULTY PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSE CHOICE FOR ITEMS OF THE COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS SCALE CATEGORIZED AS MEASURES OF ATTITUDES TOWARD SANCTIONS

Item Number	Percentages			
	AS	A	D	DS
6. Faculty organizations at local, state, and national levels should publicize unfair practices by a governing board through the media such as TV, radio, newspapers, and magazines.	27.5	41.2	24.0	7.3
21. I think faculty members have a right to impose sanctions on governing boards under certain circumstances.	13.9	64.2	17.9	4.0
22. I think that sanctions are a step forward in acceptance of faculty responsibility for self-discipline and for insistence upon conditions conducive to an effective program of education.	11.3	44.8	34.5	9.4
23. I believe sanctions are a means of improving educational opportunities and eliminating conditions detrimental to professional service.	10.3	48.3	32.5	8.9
24. I believe that censure by means of articles in professional association journals, special study reports, newspapers, or other mass media is a legitimate technique for faculty use.	17.6	54.6	22.9	4.9

TABLE 19 (continued)

27. I believe that any faculty sanction or other coercive measure is completely unprofessional.	10.2	19.5	49.8	20.5
29. I believe that when the governing board denies the requests of the faculty, the faculty has a right to present the facts to the public and to their professional associates employed in other colleges.	27.0	59.2	12.3	1.5

Nearly 59 percent agreed that sanctions are a means of improving educational opportunities and eliminating conditions detrimental to professional service (Item 23). Approximately 56 percent agreed that sanctions are a step forward in the acceptance of faculty responsibility for self-discipline and for the insistence upon conditions conducive to effective educational programs. (Item 22)

Seventy-two percent agreed that certain forms of censure were legitimate techniques for use by faculty (Item 24). Only 29 percent believed that faculty sanctions or other coercive measures were completely unprofessional (Item 27).

An analysis of the items pertaining to the withholding of faculty services indicated that such militant and severe action is viewed unfavorably by the majority of

university faculty. The percentages of responses to each item in this category appear in Table 20.

Fifty-three percent agreed that faculty members should be able to withhold services when a satisfactory agreement between their organization and the governing board cannot be reached. (Item 3) Approximately 54 percent agreed that faculty services were not so necessary to the public welfare as to necessitate the forfeiture of the right of faculty to strike. (Item 26) Over the question on the position that faculty as public employees should not strike, the faculty was evenly divided. (Item 25)

The majority of the faculty sampled felt that collective negotiations should omit the threat of withholding services. (Item 4) Approximately 62 percent agreed that faculty members should not strike in order to enforce their demands. (Item 10)

Fifty-two percent agreed that strikes, sanctions, boycotts, mandated arbitration or mediation are improper procedures to be used by public university faculty members. (Item 13) Fifty-one percent felt that a faculty member cannot withhold his services without violating professional ethics and trust. (Item 14) Approximately 80 percent felt that strikes on the part of faculty members are an undesirable aspect of collective negotiations. (Item 8)

TABLE 20

FACULTY PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSE CHOICE FOR ITEMS OF THE COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS SCALE CATEGORIZED AS MEASURES OF ATTITUDES TOWARD WITHHOLDING SERVICES

Item Number		Percentages			
		AS	A	D	DS
3.	Faculty members should be able to withhold their services when satisfactory agreement between their organization and the governing board cannot be reached.	18.0	35.6	35.6	10.8
4.	Collective negotiations should if possible omit the threat of withholding services.	28.4	52.9	14.2	4.5
8.	I feel that strikes on the part of faculty members are an undesirable aspect of collective negotiations.	33.7	45.9	14.1	6.3
10.	Faculty members should not strike in order to enforce their demands.	24.0	38.2	28.4	9.4
13.	I believe that strikes, sanctions, boycotts, mandated arbitration or mediation are improper procedures to be used by faculty who are dissatisfied with their conditions of employment.	15.7	36.8	32.8	14.7
14.	I feel that a faculty member cannot withhold his services without violating professional ethics and trust.	18.5	32.7	25.6	13.2

TABLE 20 (continued)

25. I feel that the traditional position that faculty members, as public employees, may not strike is in the best interest of public higher education.	14.3	36.5	36.9	12.3
26. I don't feel that the services of the faculty are so necessary to the public welfare as to necessitate the forfeiture of the right of faculty to strike.	12.3	41.9	39.9	5.9

Summary

This chapter presents the statistical analysis and findings of the data collected through the administration of the instruments described in Chapter III. The chapter deals in turn with each of the four hypotheses and a simple analysis of response patterns to the Collective Negotiations Scale. The multiple variate analysis of variance was used to test the first three hypotheses and the Univariate F Test and Scheffé Post Hoc Comparison test for explanatory purposes. The fourth hypothesis was tested through the Pierson Product Moment Correlation. Simple percentages were used for the analysis of responses to the Collective Negotiations Scale.

Three of the four null hypotheses were rejected. Hypothesis 1 was found significant at the .001 level of confidence, there was a relationship between attitudes toward

collective negotiations and perceived importance of institutional goals. Hypothesis 2 was found significant at the .002 level of confidence, there was a relationship between attitudes toward collective negotiations and the preferred importance of institutional goals. Hypothesis 3 was found significant at the .001 level of confidence, there was a relationship between attitudes toward collective negotiations and perception of the emphasis being given institutional functions. Hypothesis 4 was not rejected. No correlation between age, sex, rank, tenure, terminal degree status, university-wide committee membership, or faculty senate membership and attitudes toward collective negotiations was found. Faculty scores on the Collective Negotiations Scale indicated generally favorable attitudes toward the concept of collective negotiations, but less favorable attitudes toward the use of sanctions.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The concept of institutional goals has become central to the study of organizations. Such organizational theorists as March, Simon, Perrow, Thompson, and McEwen view goals as significant variables in the administrative process. However, in the study of administration of higher education, the investigation of institutional goals has been confined primarily to goal identification. Such studies have not considered goals as organizational variables nor the relation of goals to other variables such as the phenomenon of collective bargaining treated in this study.

Collective bargaining in higher education is of recent vintage. Those studies completed to date have principally investigated demographic variables and attitudes toward collective negotiations. Institutional variables that could influence faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations have largely been ignored. Since institutional goals have become central to the study of organizations, the relation of goals and bargaining should be investigated.

The work of a number of organization theorists support the idea that institutional goals and bargaining are related. March and Simon postulate that when goals are not shared, or when shared goals are not operational, bargaining will result. Perrow notes that goals are shaped by competition within the organization. Thompson and McEwen view goals as constraint sets, and bargaining as a decision process in goal selection. In this study, it is hypothesized that there is a relation between institutional goal perception and attitudes toward collective negotiations.

Three instruments were utilized to collect date on the variables treated in the study, the Institutional Goals Inventory, the Institutional Functioning Inventory-University of Oklahoma Modification, and the Collective Negotiations Scale. The instruments were distributed to a randomly selected sample of three-hundred faculty and fifty administrators. Seventy percent of the sample responded.

The multiple variate analysis of variance was used to test the first three hypotheses, and the Univariate F Test and Scheffé Post Hoc Comparison Test was utilized for explanatory purposes. The fourth hypothesis was tested through the Pierson Product Moment Correlation. Simple percentages were used for the analysis of responses to the Collective Negotiations Scale.

The basic problem of this research has been to determine if there is a relationship between the perception of institutional goals and functions in higher education and attitudes toward collective negotiations. Through the testing of the research hypotheses, it was determined that a relationship does exist between attitudes toward collective negotiations and the perception of importance attached to institutional goals and functions.

Research hypothesis One: There is no significant difference of agreement on the perceived importance of institutional goals among administrators, faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations and faculty who do not have favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. This hypothesis was found significant at the .001 level of confidence and thus rejected. A significant difference occurred among the groups on their perceptions of the importance attached to institutional goals. Significant differences in the perception of the importance attached to institutional goals was noted over eight goal areas. In seven of the goal areas where significant differences were found, it was the faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations that differed from the administrator group.

Faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective

negotiations perceived the institution as giving less importance to the following seven goal areas than did the administrator group.

> (1) Academic Development. The acquisition of general and specialized knowledge, preparation of students for advanced scholarly study, and maintenance of high intellectual standards on the campus.
>
> (4) Humanism/Altruism. Respect for diverse cultures, commitment to working for world peace, consciousness of the important moral issues of the time, and concern about the welfare of man generally.
>
> (8) Advanced Training. The items comprising the goal area have to do with developing/maintaining a strong and comprehesive graduate school, providing programs in the "traditional professions" (law, medicine, etc.), and conducting advanced study in specialized problem areas--as through a multi-disciplinary institute or center.
>
> (9) Research. The Research goal of the I.G.I. involves doing contract studies for external agencies, conducting basic research in the natural and social sciences, and seeking generally to extend the frontiers of knowledge through scientific research.
>
> (14) Freedom. In the I.G.I., Freedom is defined as protecting the right of faculty to present controversial ideas in the classroom, not preventing students from hearing controversial points of view, placing no restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty or students, and ensuring faculty and students the freedom to choose their own life cycles.
>
> (15) Democratic Governance. The central notion of this goal, as here conceived, is the opportunity for participation--participation in the decisions that affect one's working and learning life. As defined in the I.G.I., Democratic Governance means decentralized decision-making; arrangements by

> which students, faculty, administrators, and governing board members can (all) be significantly involved in campus governance, opportunity for individuals to participate in all decisions affecting them, and governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of everyone at the institution.
>
> (16) Community. In the I.G.I., Community is defined as maintaining a climate in which there is faculty commitment to the general welfare of the institution, open and candid communication, open and amicable airing of differences, and mutual trust and respect among students, faculty, and administrators.

Faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations tend to see the institution as placing less emphasis on the maintenance of high scholarship, development of strong professional programs, conducting basic research, and working for a commitment to the welfare of man than did the administrator group. Interestingly, those faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations perceive the goals of academic freedom, the participation of faculty in decision-making, and the development of trust and open communications on the campus to be receiving less emphasis at the institution than the administrator group.

Research hypothesis Two: There is no significant difference of agreement on the importance of preferred institutional goals among administrators, faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, and faculty who do not have favorable attitudes toward collec-

tive negotiations. This hypothesis was significant at the .002 level of confidence and thus rejected. A significant difference among the groups on their perception of the importance of preferred institutional goals was noted over eight goal areas.

In four of the goal areas where significant differences were found, those faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations scored higher than those faculty who do not have favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. Faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations felt that the following goal areas should be given greater emphasis than did the faculty who do not have favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations:

> (13) Social Criticism/Activism. Providing criticism of prevailing American values, offering ideas for changing social institutions judged to be defective, helping students to learn how to bring about change in American society, and being engaged, as an institution, in working for basic changes in American society.
>
> (14) Freedom. In the I.G.I., Freedom is defined as protecting the right of faculty to present controversial ideas in the classroom, not preventing students from hearing controversial points of view, placing no restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty or students, and ensuring faculty and students the freedom to choose their own life cycles.
>
> (15) Democratic Governance. The central notion of this goal, as here conceived, is the opportunity for participation--participation in the decisions that affect one's working and learning life. As

> defined in the I.G.I., Democratic Governance means decentralized decision-making; arrangements by which students, faculty, administrators, and governing board members can (all) be significantly involved in campus governance, opportunity for individuals to participate in all decisions affecting them, and governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of everyone at the institution.
>
> (19) Off-Campus Learning. The elements of the I.G.I. definition of Off-Campus Learning, as a process goal an institution may pursue, form a kind of scale. They include: (short term) time away from the campus in travel, work-study, VISTA work, etc.; arranging for students to study on several campuses during their undergraduate years; awarding degrees for supervised study off the campus; awarding degrees entirely on the basis of performance on an examination.

Faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations felt that the institution should be giving greater priority to the criticism of American society for improvement, providing greater opportunity for faculty and student input into decision-making, ensuring freedom of life styles, and promoting off-campus learning opportunities.

Interestingly, those faculty favoring collective negotiations scored significantly lower than the other two test groups on the goal area of Accountability/Efficiency. Those faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations did not feel that cost criteria should be used in deciding any program or that accountability for program effectiveness should be as important as did the administrator group or those faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward

collective negotiations. Those faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations also felt that vocational preparation or the education of students in a particular religious heritage should be of low institutional importance compared to the administrator group in the case of vocational preparation and the faculty group not favoring collective negotiations in the case of religious training.

Those faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations did not feel that Innovation or Off-Campus Learning should be of as great an importance to the institution as did the administrator group.

Research hypothesis Three: There is no significant difference of agreement in the perceived emphasis given an institutional practice among administrators, faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, and faculty who do not have favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. This hypothesis was found significant at the .001 level of confidence and thus rejected. A significant difference among the groups on their perception of the emphasis being given institutional practices was noted over fifteen function areas. In all fifteen function areas where differences in the groups perceptions of the emphasis given institutional practices was noted, it was those faculty favoring collective negotiations who scored

lower than the comparison groups of administrators and/or faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations.

In the eight function areas that follow, those faculty favoring collective negotiations scored significantly lower than both the other test groups:

> (2) Intellectual Orientation. Developing student familiarity with research and problem solving methods, the ability to synthesize knowledge from many sources, the capacity for self-directed learning, and a commitment to life-long learning.
>
> (4) Humanism/Altruism. Developing student respect for diverse cultures, commitment to working for world peace, consciousness of the important moral issues of the time, and concern about the welfare of man generally.
>
> (6) Traditional Religiousness. Educating students in a particular religious heritage, helping them to see the potentialities of full-time religious work, developing students' abilitiy to defend a theological position, and fostering their dedication to serving God in everyday life.
>
> (11) Public Service. Working with governmental agencies in social and environmental policy formation, committing institutional resources to the solution of major social and environmental problems, training people from disadvantaged communities, and generally being responsive to regional and national priorities in planning educational programs.
>
> (15) Democratic Governance. Providing for decentralized decision-making; arrangements by which students, faculty, administrators, and governing board members can (all) be significantly involved in campus governance, opportunity for individuals to participate in all decisions affecting them, and governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of everyone at the institution.

(16) Community. Community is defined as encouraging a climate in which there is faculty commitment to the general welfare of the institution, open and candid communication, open and amicable airing of differences, and mutual trust and respect among students, faculty, and administrators.

(17) Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment. Providing a rich program of cultural events, a campus climate that facilitates student free-time involvement in intellectual and cultural activities, an environment in which students and faculty can easily interact informally, and a reputation as an intellectually exciting campus.

(18) Innovation. Encouraging a climate in which continuous innovation is an accepted way of life, it means established procedures for readily initiating curricular or instructional innovations, and, more specifically, it means experimentation with new approaches to (1) individualized instruction and (2) evaluating and grading student performance.

Those faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations felt the institution was performing to a lesser degree in those function areas given above than did the other two test groups.

In the six function areas following, those faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations scored lower than those faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, but not significantly lower than the administrator group:

(1) Academic Development. Has to do with providing students with the opportunity for acquisition of general and specialized knowledge, preparation of students for advanced scholarly study, and maintenance of high intellectual standards on the campus.

(8) Advanced Training. Providing for developing/maintaining a strong and comprehensive graduate school, providing programs in the "traditional professions" (law, medicine, etc.), and conducting advanced study in specialized problem areas--as through a multi-disciplinary institute or center.

(12) Social Egalitarianism. Providing open admissions and meaningful education for all admitted, providing educational experiences relevant to the evolving interests of (1) minority groups, and (2) women, and offering remedial work in basic skills.

(13) Social Criticism/Activism. Means providing criticism of prevailing American values, offering ideas for changing social institutions judged to be defective, helping students to learn how to bring about change in American society, and being engaged, as an institution, in working for basic changes in American society.

(14) Freedom. Freedom is defined as protecting the right of faculty to present controversial ideas in the classroom, not preventing students from hearing controversial points of view, placing no restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty or students, and ensuring faculty and students the freedom to choose their own life cycles.

(20) Accountability/Efficiency. Utilization of cost criteria in deciding among program alternatives, expressing concern for program efficiency, fostering accountability to funding sources for program effectiveness, and regular submitting of evidence that the institution is achieving stated goals.

The composite that emerges is that faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations view the institution as not performing as effectively as the administrators or faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective bargaining in the function areas tested.

Research hypothesis Four: There is no significant relationship between selected biographic-career characteristics of tenure, age, sex, rank, terminal degree status, university-wide committee membership, faculty senate membership and faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations. No significant correlation between the biographic-career characteristics and scores on the Collective Negotiations Scale was found, thus the hypothesis was not rejected. Previous studies cited in Chapter II had found age, tenure, and rank related to attitudes toward collective negotiations. Those studies, however, had been conducted in highly industrialized and unionized geographic areas. This study tends to indicate that for the population sampled, the biographic-career variables could not be used as predictors of attitudes toward collective negotiations.

One of the purposes of this study was to assess the general attitude orientation of university faculty toward collective negotiations. An analysis of the data collected from the administration of the Collective Negotiations Scale indicates that the majority of university faculty sampled have favorable attitudes toward the use of collective negotiations in higher education, but there was less consensus over whether collective negotiations could bring improvement to higher education. There is considerable

consensus that faculty have the right to utilize sanctions, however, there is little favor expressed toward the various forms of sanctions, particularly withholding of services.

Conclusions

In relation to current theory, the findings contribute to the premise that institutional goals can be treated as organizational variables, and, that such characteristics of goals as shared or not shared, subject to competition, and open to bargaining, are related to attitudes toward bargaining. More specifically, the study has added to organizational theory in higher education by demonstrating that institutional goals can be treated as variables with results useful to administration and faculty. As administrators become increasingly involved in dealing with the forms of collective bargaining spreading into higher education, data on institutional goals and functions may contribute to institutional strategies for working through the problem.

The findings of this study support the conclusion that there is a relationship between faculty perception of institutional goals and functions, and their attitudes toward collective negotiations. Faculty with favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations differ markedly in their perception of the importance accorded institutional

goals and the emphasis being given institutional functions from those faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. However, faculty having unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations do not tend to disagree with administrators as to the importance accorded institutional goals or the emphasis given institutional functions.

The findings resulting from the testing of the first three hypotheses of this study tend to affirm March and Simon's theory of formal organizations related to the decision-making process. March and Simon postulated that when goals are not shared, or when shared goals are not operational, the decision process will be reached by predominantly bargaining processes. This study has shown that those faculty having favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, bargaining, differ in their perceptions of the importance attached to perceived and preferred institutional goals more frequently than administrators or faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations.

Faculty having favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations have a markedly different perception of the role reality of the institution than the administrators and faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective nego-

tiations. They see goals as being accorded less importance and functions given less emphasis than the other groups. Faculty supportive of collective negotiations do not rate the institution as high in according importance to goals or achieving functions as do the administrators and faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. This tends to support Victor Thompson's theory that conflict in organizations is due to differing perceptions of reality between those in hierarchical positions and specialists.

The perceived importance accorded institutional goals having to do with the faculty role in the institution are significantly related to attitudes toward collective negotiations. Those faculty favoring collective negotiations perceived the institution as according less importance to the goal areas of freedom, democratic governance, and community than did the administrators and faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. Faculty favoring collective negotiations felt that less academic freedom and less freedom to choose their own life style were being accorded by the institution than did the other groups. They also perceived significantly less institutional commitment to greater faculty participation in governance and in decisions affecting them than the other groups. Faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collec-

tive negotiations and administrators agreed that the institution had a greater commitment to encouraging open and candid communications and mutual trust between faculty and administrators than did those faculty favoring collective negotiations.

Not only did faculty favoring collective negotiations see those goal areas having to do with the faculty role in the institution accorded less importance than did the faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations, but they preferred a greater importance be accorded those goal areas than did the other groups. Faculty favoring collective negotiations thus appear dissatisfied with the priority being given those goals which would allow for greater faculty participation in institutional decision-making, while those faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations do not appear dissatisfied or differ from the administrators in the preferred emphasis that should be given the goal areas of freedom, democratic governance, and community. Faculty who have favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations feel that faculty should play a greater role in institutional decision-making.

While those favoring bargaining desire a greater role for faculty in governance, they would prefer that the

goal of accountability not be accorded as high an importance in the institution as the administrators and faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward bargaining. Faculty with favorable attitudes toward bargaining perceived the institution as according accountability a greater importance than the other groups, and preferred that accountability be accorded less importance than the administrators and faculty with unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations.

This study indicates that lack of consensus between administrators and faculty on institutional goals may be of greater importance than biographic-career variables in a faculty's decision to elect collective bargaining as a decision-making process in higher education. While a number of other studies have indicated a significant correlation between age, rank, tenure, and attitudes toward collective negotiations, this study does not find a significant correlation. While no correlation between demographic variables and attitudes toward collective bargaining was found, a relationship was confirmed to exist between goal perception and attitudes toward collective negotiations.

University faculty, based on those sampled in this study, view collective faculty pressure as legitimate. While faculty feel that they should have the option of

utilizing bargaining, there is hesitance in endorsing the type of aggressive actions against the administration and governing board that are often required in the bargaining process.

Implications and Suggestions for Further Research

This study implies that be determining the degree of goal consensus among faculty and between faculty and administrators, an index of a faculty's propensity to utilize collective bargaining can be determined. Additional research is needed to confirm or refute that differences between administrators and faculty in institutional goal perception is related to attitudes toward bargaining. It is recommended that similar studies be conducted utilizing samples from geographically diverse universities as well as other types of higher education institutions.

This study implies that it is important to gain information on those institutional variables related to faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations. Because human behavior is a result of interaction of a person and his environment, it is important that those variables in the institutional environment related to faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining be identified. It is recommended that studies be conducted to identify institutional variables related to attitudes toward collective negotia-

tions.

This study implies that an administration should encourage goal consensus in order to decrease the propensity of a faculty to utilize collective negotiations. Convergence of goal perception has been demonstrated by using the Delphi method. It is recommended that studies be conducted to determine if convergence of goal perception reduces favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. Research should be conducted into methods of bringing about increased goal consensus.

This study implies that the more democratic governance is at an institution, the less propensity a faculty will have to utilize collective negotiations. Studies should be conducted to compare the faculty role in goal setting and attitudes toward collective negotiations based on a variety of institutional governing patterns. Research should also be done to determine if administrative leadership patterns are related to attitudes toward collective negotiations.

This study implies that faculty feel that the utilization of collective negotiations will increase the faculty's participation in institutional goal formulation. Research should be conducted to determine if a faculty does increase its role in goal formulation and institutional

decision-making by utilizing collective negotiations.

This study implies that an administration desiring to reduce a faculty's propensity to bargaining should seek to collegialize its relationship with the faculty. It is recommended that studies be conducted to determine if the degree of collegiality between faculty and administrators is related to the propensity to favor bargaining.

This study implies that while faculty desires a greater role in governance and goal formulation, they do not desire to be held accountable for their decisions. Research is recommended to identify ways of increasing accountability that are acceptable to faculty.

The increased utilization of collective negotiations as a decision-making process in higher education requires that further studies investigate and evaluate the implications of collective negotiations as a decision-making process. How will bargaining effect all the constituencies of higher education and will it alter institutional life, and if so, how?

APPENDIX A

RANDOM SAMPLE BY DEPARTMENT AND RANK

ADMINISTRATOR SAMPLE RETURNS BY TITLE

COMPARISON OF SAMPLE RESPONDENTS AND NONRESPONDENTS

RANDOM SAMPLE BY DEPARTMENT AND RANK

Department	Professor			Associate Professor			Assistant Professor			Instructor		
	S	R	NR	S	R	NR	S	R	NR	S	R	NR
Accounting	1		1	2	2		1	1		0		
Aerospace	0			1		1	2	2		1	1	
A. M. N. E.	4	3	1	4	4		5	4	1	1		1
Anthropology	1	1		0			1	1		0		
Arch. & Env. Design	2	2		1		1	1		1	0		
Art & Art Hist.	4	3	1	1		1	2	2		0		
Astronomy	0			0			0			0		
Aviation	0			0			0			1	1	
Bot. & Micro.	1	1		2	1	1	3	3		0		
Bus. Ad.	0			0			1	1		0		
Bus. Com.Law	1		1	1		1	2	2		0		
Chem. Eng.	3	3		1	1		1		1	0		
Chemistry	6	6		0			0			1	1	
Civ. Eng.	2	1	1	1	1		2	1	1	0		
Classics	0			1	1		0			0		
Dance	1	1		0			0			0		
Drama	2		2	0			0			1		1
Econ.	3	2	1	1		1	1		1	0		
Education	6	5	1	6	6		3	2	1	0		
Elec. Eng.	2	2		2	1	1	2	1	1	0		
Engineering	1		1	0			1	1		0		
English	3		3	0			2	1	1	0		
Env. Sci.	0			0			1	1		0		
Finance	2		2	1		1	1		1	0		
Fine Arts	0			0			1		1	0		
Geography	2	1	1	2		2	1	1		1	1	
Geol. Eng.	0			0			0			0		
Geology	1	1		3	3		0			0		
Health, P.E. & Rec.	2	1	1	1		1	3	3		3	3	
History	1		1	4	3	1	4	2	2	1	1	
Hist. of Sci.	1		1	0			1		1	0		
Home Ec.	2	1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	
Hum. Rel.	0			1		1	1		1	0		
Ind. Eng.	0			2	1	1	1		1	0		

Department	Professor			Associate Professor			Assistant Professor			Instructor		
	S	R	NR	S	R	NR	S	R	NR	S	R	NR
Info.-Com. Sci.	0			0			2	2		0		
Journalism	2	1	1	0			4	2	2	1		1
Law	4	4		2	1	1	2	1	1	0		
Lib. Sci. & Lib. Staff	0			3	2	1	6	4	2	4	2	2
Lib. Stu.	0			0			0			0		
Management	2	2		1	1		1		1	0		
Marketing	1	1		1	1		1	1		0		
Math.	4	3	1	4	4		8	7	1	0		
Met. Eng.	0			1		1	0			0		
Meteor.	1	1		1		1	1	1		0		
Mil. Sci.	0			2	2		2	2		0		
Mod. Lang.	1	1		1	1		0			1		1
Music	9	8	1	5	4	1	5	4	1	3	2	1
Naval Sci.	1	1		0			1	1		1	1	
Pet. Eng.	1	1		1		1	1	1		0		
Pharm.	1	1		0			2	2		1	1	
Philosophy	1	1		1		1	1	1		0		
Phys. Ther.	0			1	1		0			0		
Physics	3	3		1		1	3	2	1	0		
Pol. Sci.	2	1	1	2	2		1	1		0		
Psych.	0			1		1	2	1	1	0		
Reg. & City Plan.	0			0			0			0		
Soc. Wk.	3	2	1	1		1	4	3	1	1		1
Sociology	0			1	1		3		3	0		
Speech Com.	2	2		1	1		1	1		2	1	1
TV	0			0			0			0		
Zoology	2	2		3	3		1		1	0		
No. Dept. Listed	3	3		1	1		3	3		0		
Rank Totals	97	72	15	78	52	26	102	71	31	23	15	8

ADMINISTRATOR SAMPLE RETURNS BY TITLE

Title	Sample Number	Respondents	Non-Respondents
Vice President	4	2	2
Associate V. P.	2	2	0
Assistant V. P.	6	5	1
Dean	8	6	2
Associate Dean	3	3	0
Assistant Dean	10	5	5
Director	17	12	5
Totals	50	35	15

COMPARISON OF SAMPLE RESPONDENTS AND NONRESPONDENTS

PERCENTAGES OF FACULTY IN SAMPLE RESPONDENTS AND SAMPLE NONRESPONDENTS BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHICAL VARIABLES

Variable	Percentages	
	Sample Respondents	Sample Nonrespondents
Rank:		
Professor	.34	.28
Associate Professor	.25	.29
Assistant Professor	.34	.34
Instructor	.07	.09
Sex:		
Male	.88	.89
Female	.12	.11
Length of Institutional Service:		
Five years or less	.45	.48
More than five years	.55	.52
Tenure:		
Tenured	.68	.71
Non-tenured	.32	.29
Discipline:		
Biological Sciences	.052	.022
Physical Sciences	.105	.057
Mathematics	.071	.022
Social Sciences	.090	.200
Humanities	.052	.034
Fine Arts	.119	.133
Education	.100	.044
Business	.048	.044
Engineering	.148	.222
Other	.215	.222

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

American Association for Higher Education. Faculty Participation in University Governance. Washington, D.C.: A.A.H.E., 1967.

American Association of Colleges. Collective Bargaining: Its Fiscal Implications. 1970. (Mimeographed.)

Barzun, Jacques. The American University: How It Runs And Where It is Going. New York: Harper, 1968.

Bowen, Howard R., and Douglas, Gordon K. Efficiency in Liberal Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

_____, and Servelle, Paul. Who Benefits From Higher Education and Who Should Pay? Washington, D.C.: A.A.H.E., 1972.

Budig, Gene, ed. Perceptions in Public Higher Education. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1970.

Caffrey, John, ed. The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Carlton, Patrick. Attitudes of Certified Instructional Personnel in North Carolina Toward Questions Concerning Collective Negotiations and Sanctions. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1966.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The More Effective Use of Resources: An Imperative for Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Cheit, Earl F. The New Depression in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1071.

Chickering, A. W. Education and Identity. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Boss, Inc., 1968.

Cramer, Elliot, and Thurston, L. L. O. U. Manova Program. Chapel Hill, N. C.: Psychometric Laboratory, University of North Carolina, n.d.

Creal, Richard C. A Study of the Factors Which Influence The Course of Negotiations Toward Resolution or Impasses In Selected Community Colleges. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969.

Demerath, Nicholas; Stephens, Richard; and Taylor, Robb. Power, Presidents, and Professors. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967.

Dixon, W. J., ed. Biomedical Computer Program. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1970.

Educational Testing Service. Descriptions of I. G. I. Goal Areas. Princeton, N. J.: E.T.S., 1972. (Mimeographed.)

Etzioni, Amita. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Gross, Edward, and Grambsch, Paul V. University Goals and Academic Power. Washington, D.C.: A.C.E., 1968.

Guilford, J. P. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

Hack, Walter, et al, eds. Educational Administration: Selected Readings. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.

Haehn, James O. A Study of Trade Unionism Among State College Professors. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1969.

_____. A Survey of Faculty and Administrator Attitudes On Collective Bargaining. Los Angeles: Academic Senate of the California State Colleges, 1970.

Hamelman, Paul, ed. Managing the University: A Systems Approach. New York: Praeger Pub., 1972.

Hill, Walter A., and Egan, Douglas. Readings in Organization Theory: A Behavioral Approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1966.

Horn, Francis. Challenge and Perspective in Higher Education. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971.

Hutchins, Robert. The University in America. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1966.

Joughin, Louis, ed. Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Handbook of the A.A.U.P. Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

Kerr, Clark. The Uses of the University. New York: Harper, 1963.

Kruytbosch, Carlos, and Messinger, Sheldon, eds. The State of the University: Authority and Change. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1968.

Lane, Robert E. Faculty Unionism in a California State College. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967.

Lawrence, Ben; Weathersby, George; and Palters, Virginia, eds. The Outputs of Higher Education: Their Proxies, Measurement, and Evaluation. Boulder, Colo.: W.I.C.H.E., 1970.

March, James G., and Simon, Herbert A. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Minter, W. J., and Lawrence, Ben, eds. Management Information Systems: Their Development and Use in the Administration of Higher Education. Boulder, Colo.: W.I.C.H.E., 1969.

Moore, John W. The Attitudes of Pennsylvania Community College Faculty Toward Collective Negotiations in Relation to Their Sense of Power and Sense of Mobility. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1970.

Mortimer, Kenneth P. Accountability in Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: A.A.H.E., 1972.

Nash, Patricia. The Goals of Higher Education--An Empirical Assessment. New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

Orland, Harold. The Effects of Federal Programs on Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: The Brooking Institute, 1962.

Parsons, Talcott. Structure and Process in Modern Societies. New York: Free Press, 1960.

Perkins, James. The University in Transition. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Peterson, Richard E. Goals for California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 Academic Communities. Berkeley, Calif.: Educational Testing Service, 1972. (A Preliminary and Incomplete Draft.)

_____. Goals for California Higher Education Study. Berkeley, Calif.: E. T. S., 1973.

_____. The Crisis of Purpose: Definitions and Uses of Institutional Goals. Report No. 5. Washington, D. C.: E.R.I.C. Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1970.

_____. Toward Institutional Goal Consciousness. Berkeley, Calif.: E.T.S., 1971.

_____; Centra, John A.; Hartnett, Rodney T.; and Linn, Robert. Institutional Functioning Inventory Preliminary Manual. Princeton, N. J.: E.T.S., 1970.

Sanford, Nevitt. The American College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

Schulman, Carol H. Collective Bargaining on Campus. Washington, D.C.: A.A.H.E., 1972.

Stoke, Harold. The American College President. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

Swanson, Elaine S., and Swanson, G.I., eds. Educational Planning in the United States. Itasic, Ill.: 1969.

Swarr, Philip. Goals of Colleges and Universities As Perceived and Preferred by Faculty and Administrators. Unpublished report. Cortland, N. Y.: Office of Institutional Research, State University College, 1971.

Tice, Terrence, ed. Faculty Power: Collective Bargaining On Campus. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute of Continuing Legal Education, 1972.

Uhl, Norman. Identifying College Goals the Delphi Way. Topical Papers and Reprints, No. 2. Durham, N. C.: National Laboratory of Higher Education, 1971.

_____. Identifying Institutional Goals. Durham, N. C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1971.

Weber, Arnold R. Academic Negotiations: Alternatives to Collective Bargaining. Report presented at the 22nd National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the A.A.H.E. Chicago, March 6, 1967. (E.R.I.C. ED 014 122.)

Wriston, Henry. The Academic Procession. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Yoder, Dale. Personnel Management and Industrial Relations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.

B. ARTICLES

Benezet, Louis T. "Continuity and Change: The Need for Both," in The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change. Edited by John Caffrey. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Boyd, William. "Collective Bargaining in Academe: Causes and Consequences," Liberal Education, 57(Oct., 1971), pp. 300-318.

Brown, J. Douglas. "Mr. Ruml's Memoirs: A Wrong Approach to a Right Problem," Journal of Higher Education, 30(Nov., 1959), p. 415.

Brown, Ralph. "Collective Bargaining for the Faculty," Liberal Education, 56(March, 1970), pp. 75-78.

Carmichael, Oliver C. "Major Strengths and Weaknesses in Higher Education," Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: A.A.H.E., 1953.

Clark, Burton. "The New University," in The State of the University: Authority and Change. Edited by Carlos Kruytbosch and Sheldon Messinger. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1968.

Danforth News and Notes. St. Louis: Danforth Foundation, November, 1969.

Faulkner, Donald. "The Formation of Institutional Objectives," Journal of Higher Education, 29(Nov., 1958), pp. 425-430, 469.

Finkin, Matthew. "Collective Bargaining and University Government," A.A.U.P. Bulletin, 57(June, 1971), pp. 149-162.

Garbarino, Joseph. "Precarious Professors: New Patterns of Representation," Industrial Relations, 10(Feb., 1972), pp. 1-20.

Haus, Marie R., and Sussman, Marvin B. "Professionalization and Unionism," American Behavioral Scientist, 14(March-April, 1971), pp. 525-540.

Heim, Peggy. "Growing Tensions in Academic Administration," North Central Association Quarterly, 42(Winter, 1967), pp. 244-251.

Henderson, Also. "Control in Higher Education: Trends and Issues," Journal of Higher Education, 40(Jan., 1969), pp. 1-11.

Hughes, Clarence. "Collective Bargaining and the Private Colleges," Intellect, (Oct., 1972), pp. 41-42.

Hullfish, Gordon. "A Theoretical Consideration of Educational Administration," in Educational Administration: Selected Readings. Edited by Walter G. Hack, et al. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965.

Kugler, Isreal. "Collective Bargaining for Faculties," Liberal Education, 56(March, 1970), pp. 78-85.

_____. "The Union Speaks for Itself," Educational Record, 49(Fall, 1969), pp. 414-418.

Lawrence, Ben. "The W.I.C.H.E. Planning and Management Systems Program: Its Nature, Scope, and Limitations," in Managing the University: A Systems Approach. Edited by Paul Hamelman. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.

Lipset, Seymour, and Ladd, Everett. "The Divided Professoriate," Change, 3(May-June, 1971), pp. 54-60.

McConnell, T. R. "The Function of Leadership in Academic Institutions," Educational Record, 49(Winter, 1968), pp. 145-153.

Moran, William. "A Systems View of University Organization," in Managing the University: A Systems Approach. Edited by Paul Hamelman. New York, Praeger Publishers, 1972.

Nelson, Charles s. "Observations on the Scope of Higher Education Planning in the United States," in Managing the University: A Systems Approach. Edited by Paul Hamelman. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.

"Faculty Bargaining Effective," Norman Transcript. Feb. 6, 1973.

Oklahoma. Legislature. House. "Establishing the Right of Collective Bargaining by the Professional Staff of Colleges; Providing for Recognition of Bargaining Agents for Professional Staff of Colleges," House Bill 1348. 34th Leg., 1st sess., 1973.

Osmunson, Robert Lee. "Higher Education as Viewed by College and University Presidents," School and Society, 98(Oct., 1970), pp. 369-370.

Palola, Ernest; Lehmann, Timothy; and Blishke, William. "The Reluctant Planner: Faculty in Institutional Planning," Journal of Higher Education, 42(Oct., 1971), pp. 587-602.

Perrow, Charles. "The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organizations," American Sociological Review, 26(Dec., 1961), pp. 854-866.

Peterson, Richard E. "Reform in Higher Education: Remarks of the Left and Right," Liberal Education, 55(March, 1969), pp. 60-74.

Ping, Charles J. "On Learning to Live With Collective Bargaining," Journal of Higher Education, 44(Feb., 1973), pp. 102-114.

Rehmus, Charles M. "Alternatives to Bargaining and Traditional Governance," in Faculty Power: Collective Bargaining on Campus. Edited by Terrence Tice. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute of Continuing Legal Education, 1972.

Riesman, David. "The Collision Course of Higher Education," Journal of College Student Personnel, 10(Nov., 1969), pp. 363-369.

Scully, Malcolm G. "Should Faculties Organize?" in Faculty Power: Collective Bargaining on Campus. Edited by Terrence Tice. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute of Continuing Legal Education, 1972.

Simon, Herbert A. "On the Concept of Organizational Goals," Administrative Science Quarterly, 9(June, 1964), pp. 2-22.

_____. "The Job of a College President," Educational Record, 49(Winter, 1969), p. 70.

Smith, Allen F. "Should Faculties Organize?" in Faculty Power: Collective Bargaining on Campus. Edited by Terrence Tice. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute of Continuing Legal Education, 1972.

Thompson, James D., and McEwen, William J. "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal Setting as an Interaction Process," American Sociological Review, 23(Feb., 1958), pp. 23-31.

Thompson, Victor A. "Hierarchy, Specialization and Organizational Conflict," Administrative Science Quarterly, 5(March, 1961), pp. 485-521.

Wharton, Clifton. "Internal Decision Processes of the University," Educational Record, 52(Summer, 1971), pp. 240-243.

Winstead, Philip, and Hobson, Edward. "Institutional Goals: Where to From Here?" Journal of Higher Education, 42(Nov., 1971), pp. 669-677.